ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY OF THE DISCIPLES of CHRIST

GTU
ATLA fiche

WALTER WILSON JENNINGS

Origin and Early History of the Disciples of Christ

By
WALTER WILSON JENNINGS

CINCINNATI
THE STANDARD PUBLISHING COMPANY

Copyright, 1919
The Standard Publishing Company

To the Memory of
ALMA,
Sister and Friend.

CONTENTS

PAGE.

I. General Social and Religious Conditions, 1790-1860.

Adoption of the Constitution 13
Population growth—states, cities 14
Reaching the new home—routes of travel, methods 17
Waves of emigration 21
Frontier life—dress, homes, furniture, customs 21
Roads—wagon, railroad 24
Religious waves—camp meetings, Cane Ridge 26
General religious and moral conditions 30
Missionary tours of Mills, Schermerhorn, and Smith 32
Mrs. Trollope on revivals, camp meetings, and cottage prayer meetings 35
Conditions in the older states 40
Examples of illiberality—breaches in the walls 42
Statistics on growth of churches 44

II. Preliminary Movements.

General statement 55
O'Kelly's protest 55
Baltimore conference—right of appeal 57
Secession—effects on the Methodist Church 59
Organization of a new church—"Republican Methodist". 62
Name changed 63
Principles of the new organization 63
Secessions from the Baptists of New England—Jones and Smith 64
Stone's early religious difficulties 65
Break with the Presbyterians 67

CONTENTS

Formation of the Springfield Presbytery 69
"The Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery" 70
"The Witnesses' Address" 71
Arrival of Shakers—their influence 72
Formation of the Christian Connection Church 75

III. Three Early Leaders.

Thomas Campbell's early life 76
He enters Glasgow University 78
He settles at Ahorey, Ireland, as minister 80
Unsettled political conditions 80
Religious conditions in northern Ireland 83
Thomas Campbell's attempts at reunion 85
He leaves Ireland for America 86
Alexander Campbell's early life 87
Positive religious influences 89
Alexander Campbell enters Glasgow University 93
The Haldanes and Ewing 93
Alexander Campbell refuses to commune with his Seceder brethren 98
He joins his father in America 99
Walter Scott comes to America 99
His early work 100
Walter Scott and Alexander Campbell compared 101
Scott is chosen evangelist of the Mahoning Association 103
Scott at work 105
Closing years of his life 108
His contributions to the Disciples 108

IV. Relations with Other Religious Bodies—Presbyterians.

Thomas Campbell and communion 110
His trial and censure by the Presbytery 111
Appeal to the Synod 111

CONTENTS

Withdrawal from Presbyterians 113
Formation of the Christian Association 114
The *Declaration and Address* 118
Alexander Campbell decides to devote his life to the defence of the principles contained in the *Declaration and Address* 124
Thomas Campbell asks admission to the Synod of Pittsburg 125
Alexander Campbell's reply to the Synod's refusal 126
Why he refuses to be a party man 128
He debates infant baptism 129
Formation of the Brush Run Church 130
Question of baptism 131
Alexander Campbell decides to be baptized 136
His father and others follow his example 136
Effects of the baptisms 137

V. Relations to Other Religious Bodies—Baptists.

Campbell's opinion of the Baptist ministers and people. 139
Union with the Baptists 141
Proposed removal 142
Alexander Campbell becomes independent 143
Thomas Campbell leaves his school at Cambridge, and opens one at Pittsburg 144
Alexander Campbell solicits funds for a church building at Wellsburg 145
He preaches in a Baptist church in Philadelphia 146
Persecution becomes more marked among the Baptists 147
Sermon on the Law, 1816 149
Differences between the Campbells and the Baptists 153
Alexander Campbell begins to debate 156
Adamson Bentley and Sidney Rigdon 156
Formation of Mahoning Baptist Association 157
Establishment of the *Christian Baptist* 158
Increased opposition of the Baptists 158
Campbell unites with Mahoning Baptist Association 160

CONTENTS

Papers and publications 161
The "Reformation" in Ohio 162
Walter Scott preaches the "Gospel steps" at New Lisbon 164
Stone's followers in Ohio 168
Campbell and the Virginia Constitutional Convention 170
Reasons for serving in convention 179
The Beaver Anathema and its results 181
Reasons for the success of the new movement 188

VI. Union—Opposition—Causes Therefor.

Stone's words concerning Campbell 191
Kentucky union—speeches of Smith and Stone 192
Stone on the union 195
Effects of the union on the Christian Connection 197
Likenesses and differences between "Christians" and Disciples 197
Persecution of Reformers by Baptists 200
Cases of exclusion 204
Action of associations 206
Newman's tribute to Alexander Campbell 208
Methodists oppose the Reformers—Cartwright and Shaw. 209
Reasons for opposition 212
Campbell's attack on the clergy 212
Campbell's early opposition to Bible, tract, and missionary societies, Sunday-schools, and associations 221
Changes begin—growing liberality 224

VII. Teachings and Practices of the Disciples of Christ.

Attitude towards creeds 226
Plan of salvation—faith, repentance, immersion, remission of sins, gift of the Holy Spirit, eternal life 230
Weekly communion 237
Literalism 239
Bible dispensations 242

CONTENTS

Church government 243
Distinction between the Sabbath and Lord's Day 247
No trouble over the question of the Trinity 249
Freedom of opinion in non-essentials 251
Errett's summary of Campbell's teaching 252

VIII. Methods of Work.

Preaching 253
Debates—with MacCalla, Owen and Rice 256
Effect of debates 274
Use of the press 279
Educational work—Bethany College 281
Missionary work 288

IX. Difficulties and Progress, 1830-1866.

Mormonism 293
Name of the new movement 300
Millennium 306
"Lunenburg Letter" 307
Communion 311
The organ question 311
Slavery 314
War 321
Numerical increase 322
Summary 325

Bibliography 329

Appendix I. Growth of Certain States 339

Appendix II. Growth of Particular Cities 342

Appendix III. Map Showing Important Early Centers of the Movement 344

PREFACE

IN writing this book, which was prepared as a doctor's thesis at the University of Illinois, the author has tried to show the origin, and, without bias, to trace the early history of the Disciples of Christ. The imperfections of the work are due to him alone; its merits, if it has any, are due in large part to others who have written and advised. Publication in book form is due to the courtesy of Professor David Kinley, Dean of the Graduate School, and of Professor E. B. Greene, head of the department of history.

The writer has received help from several University members, in particular from Professors L. M. Larson and W. S. Robertson, under whose direction the work was prepared. To the first he is especially indebted for careful corrections of the manuscript and valuable suggestions concerning content; to the second he is also indebted for corrections and for suggestions concerning publication. Professor P. L. Windsor of the Library School and his assistants have likewise rendered help by borrowing books for the use of the author, and in many cases by purchasing needed books, which were added to the University library. The writer has also enjoyed the use of the library of

Stephen E. Fisher, the minister of University Place Church of Christ, and of G. R. Shawhan, the veteran teacher of that church.

No acknowledgment can be adequate which fails to express the value of the help and encouragement given by numerous friends and relatives. Their belief and confidence in the author cheered him on in his work and many times changed night to day. Especially does he wish to acknowledge the help afforded by his mother. To her sacrifices and encouragement, more than to anything else, is due the completion of his university course and the book which is humbly offered to the reading public. WALTER WILSON JENNINGS.

CHAMPAIGN, Illinois, January 21, 1919.

Irish westward came after 1810 - not before (as 1790).

I

GENERAL SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS, 1790-1860

AFTER the winning of American independence and the failure of the Articles of Confederation, a vigorous movement was launched for a real government. This movement culminated in the constitutional convention of 1787, which, after many bitter disputes ending in mutual compromises, submitted its work to Congress and through that body to the states.[1] Virulent fights followed in many state ratifying conventions, but New Hampshire, the ninth state, ratified June 21, 1788, by a vote of 57 to 46, and hence a new government was given to the young republic.[2] Virginia and New York soon followed the leaders, but North Carolina did not come under the "new roof" until November, 1789, over six months after Washington's inauguration as president. The thirteenth state, reluctant Rhode Island, finally came to terms and entered the Union, May 29, 1790.[3]

---

[1] McLaughlin, A. C. *The Confederation and Constitution*, 277, 278.
[2] See *Constitution, Article* VII.
[3] McLaughlin, A. C. *The Confederation and Constitution*, 277-317.

The population of this new republic according to the first census, 1790, was 3,929,214. The increase was very rapid. The total population for each census year, 1800-1860, was:

1800— 5,308,483.
1810— 7,239,881.
1820— 9,638,453.
1830—12,866,020.
1840—17,069,453.
1850—23,191,876.
1860—31,443,321.[4]

Naturally some states increased more rapidly than others.[5] Among these, were the nine new western states, 1790-1821. The following table shows their date of admission, and their relative rank in 1820 and 1850:

	Date of Admission.	Rank in 1820.	Rank in 1850.
Kentucky	1792	6	8
Tennessee	1796	9	5
Ohio	1803	5	3
Louisiana	1812	17	18
Indiana	1816	18	7
Mississippi	1817	21	15
Illinois	1818	24	11
Alabama	1819	19	12
Missouri	1821	23	13

This thirty year period registered an increase of over 300 per cent. for the nine new western

[4] *Statistical Abstract*, 1916, 36, 37.
[5] See Appendix 1.

states, while the other states increased less than 100 per cent.[6]

The North Central States showed a remarkable growth, 1790-1860. Ohio increased five fold during the decade ending in 1810, doubled its population during the next ten year period, and showed a rapid growth in the following decades. Indiana increased over four fold, 1800-1810, six fold during the next ten year period, and almost doubled during each of the four succeeding decades. Illinois increased four fold for the period, 1810-1820, more than three fold during the next decade, and practically doubled in each of the succeeding ten year periods. Missouri trebled during the first ten years before its admission, more than doubled in each of the next two decades, and almost did so in the last two. Michigan doubled, 1810-1820, increased over three fold, 1820-1830, almost seven fold, 1830-1840, and nearly doubled in each of the two following decades. Wisconsin contained ten times as many people in 1850 as in 1840, and in 1860 the population was double that of 1850. Other western states showed a steady growth, but not so rapid as the North Central States. Kentucky and Tennessee, two of the important pioneer states, increased threefold during the last decade of the eighteenth century and doubled during the first ten years of the nineteenth. Alabama increased two

[6] *Statistical Abstract*, 1916, 36, 37. The table given above was suggested by one in Thompson, C. M. *History of the United States*, 161.

and a half fold, 1820-1830, while its neighbor, Mississippi, had grown five fold, 1800-1810, doubled in each of the next two decades, and nearly trebled 1830-1840. Arkansas increased fourteen fold for the ten year period ending in 1820, doubled during the following decade, trebled in the next, and more than doubled in each of the succeeding decades. Texas trebled, 1850-1860.

Another indication of the rapid growth of the West is found in statistics for the cities. In 1810, there were only two cities of any size west of the mountains—New Orleans and Pittsburg. By 1840, however, Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis, New Orleans, and Pittsburg each had over 10,000, and by 1860, four cities—New Orleans, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and Chicago—had passed the 100,000 mark. Cities, elsewhere, also grew rapidly during the period. In 1800, only 3.9 per cent and in 1840, 8.5 per cent of the people lived in cities of over 8000, but in 1850, 12.49 per cent and in 1860, 16.13 per cent lived in such places.[7] The drift towards the city, nevertheless, had really begun during the decade, 1820-1830. By 1840, there were forty-four cities with a population of 8000 or more; in 1860 there were 141.[8]

In 1790, the population of the country was largely confined to the coastal states,—omitting Florida, then Spanish,—and most of Georgia.

---

[7] Bogart, E. L. *Economic History of the United States*, 252.
[8] *Ibid.*, 256. See Appendix II.

Settlements had begun, however, in north central Kentucky and in central Tennessee. In 1810, the line had been pushed westward over New York, Pennsylvania, and into Ohio, and practically all of Kentucky and Tennessee. Settlements had also started well in Georgia, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, and along the Mississippi River in southern Illinois and in Missouri. By 1830, southern Indiana and Illinois, and eastern Missouri were largely settled as were Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. By 1860, the Mississippi River was passed and the second tier of states beyond was entered. The frontier line was also pushed forward into central Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Even at that time, however, there were areas of sparsely peopled land far to the east, as in northern Maine, northern New York, northern Pennsylvania, western Virginia, and southern Florida.

In opening the new western settlements, many hardships were undergone both on the journey and after arrival in the new home. The first emigrants crossed the mountains or followed wilderness trails and settled in western New York, western Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Tennessee. The Ohio River soon became an important route for settlers from the Middle States. Emigrants from Virginia used the Kanawha to reach the Ohio. Those from the Carolinas and Georgia traveled westward by land or floated down the Cumberland or Tennessee. After the completion of the Erie Canal in 1825,

and the opening of other canals, these routes were used. River transportation became more important with the introduction of the steamboat on the Ohio in 1811, and on the Mississippi in 1816. When the Cumberland Road was opened, it offered the best opportunity for land transportation. The location of the routes used, of course, largely determined the nativity of settlers in the different regions. To the north, the New England and New York elements were in the majority; to the south, settlers from Virginia and the Carolinas predominated; in southern Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, the North and South met.[8]

Different methods of travel were used in reaching this new "promised land." On the wagon roads some walked, some rode on horseback, and some drove light wagons or wagons of the Conestoga type, which were drawn by horses, mules, or oxen. Families from the north went singly or in groups. The older boys drove by turn, the children kept the cattle and extra horses from straying, while the father hunted for game, and kept a sharp lookout for a place to settle. At night they camped by the road side, near a spring of water if possible, cooked their food, fed their horses and cattle, and prepared for another day's journey of fifteen or twenty miles. Morris Birkbeck in *Notes on a Journey in America,* described travel by wagon thus:

[8] Turner, F. J. *Rise of the New West,* 67-83.

"A small waggon (so light that you may almost carry it, yet strong enough to bear a good load of bedding, utensils, and provisions, and a swarm of young citizens, and to sustain marvellous shocks in its passage over these rocky heights) with two small horses; sometimes a cow or two, comprises their all; excepting a little store of hard earned cash for the land office of the district; where they may obtain a title for as many acres as they possess half-dollars, being one-fourth of the purchase money. The waggon has a tilt, or cover, made of a sheet or perhaps a blanket. The family are seen before, behind, or within the vehicle according to the road or weather, or perhaps the spirit of the party.

"The New Englanders, they say, may be known by the cheerful air of the women advancing in front of the vehicle; the Jersey people by their being fixed steadily within it; whilst the Pennsylvanians creep lingering behind, as though regretting the homes they have left. A cart and single horse frequently afford the means of transfer, sometimes a horse and pack saddle. Often the back of the poor pilgrim bears all his effects and his wife follows, naked-footed, bending under the hopes of the family."[10]

Moving a plantation family overland involved greater expense than the emigration of a northern family, for tools, work animals, slaves, etc. had to be moved. The negroes usually enjoyed the changing scenery by day, and the camp fire singing and dancing by night. Thomas Babney, a Virginia slave holder, bought four thousand acres of land in Mississippi and moved west. Smedes in *Memorials of a Southern Planter* described the un-

[10] Reprinted in Bogart and Thompson's *Readings in the Economic History of the United States*, 352, 353.

eventful trip to the new home in the following manner:

"The journey was made with so much care and forethought that not a case of serious illness occurred on the route. The whole families were quartered at night, if practicable, in the houses that they found along the way. Tents were provided for the negroes. The master himself, during the entire journey, did not sleep under a roof. The weather was perfect: no heavy rains fell during the two months. He wrapped himself in his great-coat, with sometimes the addition of a blanket, and slept all night in their midst, under one of the travelling wagons." [11]

River travel was easier and less expensive, but much more dangerous, for accidents were frequent and river pirates were more troublesome than Indians. At Pittsburg or Wheeling, the traveler bought or built a crude raft, which he used to transport his family and belongings on his journey down the Ohio. He had to avoid snags and shoals. In the day time he floated down the current, and at night he tied up along the bank. After the trip was ended, he broke up the raft for its lumber and iron, and prepared to settle nearby, or to go on by land. The wealthier emigrants and men without families often used the steamboat, which rapidly became the principal means of travel and communication on the rivers and Lakes.[12] Whether travel was by land or water, however, the journey from

[11] Reprinted in Callender's *Selections from the Economic History of the United States*, 642.

[12] Babcock, K. C. *The Rise of American Nationality*, 243-245, and Turner, F. J. *Rise of the New West*, 80-82.

the sea board to the West was hard and dangerous. Exposure and the general harsh frontier conditions combined to weed out the weakling and the faint hearted.

In this westward movement there were three general classes of emigrants. First, was the pioneer who engaged in rude agriculture, but spent most of his time in hunting and fishing. When other settlers came in, he felt crowded, sold his claim under the pre-emption law, and pushed further westward. The second class, or the settlers, bought government land or squatter claims, built log houses furnished with glass windows and brick chimneys, and erected school houses and mills. The third class, men of capital and enterprise, followed the farmers.

The members of the first class are of interest here. The men wore hunting shirts, waist coats, and pantaloons of rough stuff. The women dressed in coarse cotton gowns and used sunbonnets almost continually, especially when company was present. The cabins in which these pioneers lived were crude affairs. The roof was made of clapboards four feet by six to eight inches wide and one half inch thick. Puncheons for the floor were made by splitting trees eighteen inches in diameter into slabs two to three inches thick and hewn on the upper surface. The doorway was made by cutting out the logs after raising, and putting upright pieces of timber at the sides. Shutters were made of clapboards, pinned on cross pieces,

hung by wooden hinges and fastened by wooden latches. When all was ready, the neighbors collected for the house raising. Four men stationed at the corners notched logs together while the rest raised them. The roof was formed by shortening each end log in succession till one log formed the comb. Clapboards, held down by poles or small logs, were used to cover all cracks. The chimney was built of sticks of wood, the largest at the bottom and the smallest at the top, the whole being cemented with mud or clay mortar. Interstices between logs were chinked with strips of wood and daubed with mortar both inside and out. Once in a while, a double cabin might be seen. It consisted of two such buildings with a space of ten or twelve feet between, over which the roof extended. A log house was better. It differed from the cabin in that the logs were hewn on two sides before raising, the roofs were framed and shingled, and the chimneys of stone or brick. Moreover, it had windows, tight floors, and was frequently clapboarded on the outside and plastered within. Nails and glass window panes were not needed.

The furniture matched the house. The table was usually made of a split slab and supported by four round legs. Chairs were equally crude. Clapboards supported by pins stuck to the logs served as shelves for table furniture. Plates were of pewter or tin, and hunting knives sometimes took the place of the regular table knives. Bed-

steads were often made in the corner of the room by sticks placed in the logs, and supported at the outer corner by a post, on which clapboards were laid. The ends of these clapboards entered the wall between the logs and supported the bedding. In some instances all the family of both sexes with the strangers who might arrive lodged in the same room. In that case, however, the undergarments were never taken of, and no consciousness of indelicacy was manifested. The few pins stuck in the wall of the cabin displayed the dresses of the women and the hunting shirts of the men.[18] Peck's description of a meal in one of these pioneer homes deserves quoting entire:

"Our landlady having nothing in the shape of a table substituted a box. On this she spread a cloth that might have answered any other purpose than a table cloth. The table furniture was various. For knives two or three hunting knives answered. The plates were broken or melted pewter ones, except a single earthen one with a notch broken out, which, with a broken fork, was placed for the "stranger" to use. We could readily have excused the kind old lady for this extra trouble; for being dimsighted, in washing, or more strictly in wiping it, she had left the print of her fingers on the upper surface.

"The viands now only need description to complete this accurate picture of real squatter life. The rancid bacon when boiled could have been detected by a fœtid atmosphere across the yard, had there been one. The snap-beans, as an accompaniment, were not half-boiled. The sour butter milk taken from the churn, where the milk was kept throughout the whole season, as it came from the cow was 'no go.'

[18] Peck, J. M. *A New Guide for Emigrants to the West*, 114-120.

The article on which the traveller made a hearty breakfast, past ten o'clock in the morning, was the corn boiled in fair water.

"According to universal custom among the squatter race, the men eat first, the women followed, and, if the company were numerous, the youngsters and children followed in regular succession.

"We give this portraiture as a fair specimen of hundreds of families we found scattered over the extreme settlement in 1818-19."[14]

As time went on, however, houses, customs, and even roads improved. Nevertheless, the latter continued poor for a long time. The people were often far from town, and news spread slowly. One of the principal causes of this delay was the bad roads. These often gave rise to laughable incidents. On one occasion, while Peter Cartwright was riding near Springfield, Illinois, he stopped at a little country store. Here he noticed two young men and a young woman who soon left the building. A little later, Cartwright mounted his lame pony and started on his way. After he had gone a short distance, he drew near these young people who were in a good wagon drawn by a fine team. They then began to shout and to sing the good old Methodist tunes. One young man fell down on his knees, groaning, whereupon his companions shouted, "Halleluiah! Halleluiah! Glory to God! Glory to God! Another sinner's down." At first Cartwright

[14] Babcock, Rufus. *Memoir of John Mason Peck, D.D. Edited from His Journals and Correspondence*, 102, 103.

thought that they were sincere, but he soon detected laughter. He tried to pass his tormentors, but they whipped up. He slowed down. So did they. All the time they kept up the chorus of "Glory to God! Glory to God! Another sinner's down." The old circuit rider was highly indignant. He wanted to horsewhip the boys, but held back because of the girl. Suddenly a gleam of hope came to him. He thought of a bridle path around a deep mudhole and a stump in the road just ahead. By taking the cut he could perhaps get away from his tormentors. He tried. They whipped up, and in their anxiety to continue the fun, raced through the mud unmindful of their clothes and the white dress of the girl, and forgetful of the stump just at the edge of the deep mudhole. One of the front wheels mounted the stump, and as the wagon overturned, the two boys jumped, sinking almost to their waists. The girl did likewise, but she fell flat in the mud and water, with her mouth and the whole of her face immersed in the dirty slime. Here she would have smothered if the boys had not helped her out. Cartwright turned, when he saw what had happened, rode to the edge of the mudhole, reared in his stirrups, and shouted: "Glory to God! Glory to God! Halleluiah! Another sinner's down! Glory to God! Halleluiah! Glory! Halleluiah!" Then, after he had become tired of shouting, he said:

"Now you poor, dirty, mean sinners, take this as a just judgment of God upon you for your meanness, and repent

of your dreadful wickedness; and let this be the last time you attempt to insult a preacher; for if you repeat your abominable sport and persecutions, the next time God will serve you worse, and the devil will get you.''[15]

During the early period, railroads were not in use in the West. In 1830, there were only twenty-three miles in operation in the whole United States, and in 1835 the number of miles was but 1098. In 1840, the railway mileage was 2818; in 1850, 9021; in 1860, 30,626. In the latter year, some of the western states led. Thus, Ohio had 2946 miles; Illinois, 2790; New York, 2682; Pennsylvania, 2598; and Indiana, 2163.[16] With the growth of railroad mileage, and the opening of new and better roads, the facility of communication was improved and the isolation of the frontier began to pass.

Throughout the whole of this period enthusiastic religious waves frequently swept over the country. One of these early awakenings was the Great Revival in the West, 1797-1805. Out on the frontier all denominations worked under difficulties. Meeting houses were poor and few. Often preaching was held by the roadside. Since ministers were scarce, church ordinances could not be administered regularly. Then too, the necessity of providing for daily needs often drove the thought of religion from people's minds. Many of the outlying settlements were seldom visited by

[15] *Autobiography of Peter Cartwright*, 312-316.
[16] *Statistical Abstract*, 1916, 292.

ministers. The Baptist and Presbyterian clergy were rather closely confined to the churches under their immediate charge. The Methodist itinerant, however, penetrated the heart of the wilderness, preaching in the cabin or on the roadside, whenever and wherever he could make the opportunity. In the absence of ministers, a simple service of prayer, Bible reading, and singing was conducted by some layman. In these newer regions, as in the mission field to-day, a friendly feeling was often manifest in spite of doctrinal differences. It was not at all uncommon to find the different churches uniting in the larger meetings, although the Baptists were a little more aloof than the others. Periods of feverish anxiety often succeeded periods of seeming indifference. People then threw aside their ordinary tasks, journeyed dozens of miles, and camped out a week or more in order to hear the Gospel tidings. It must be remembered, of course, that many people attended out of mere curiosity, and others because there was nowhere else to go for a social time. Our modern amusements of picture shows, theaters, etc., were then unknown on the frontier. Whatever the cause, nevertheless, small cities of white tents sprang up for a while, as if by magic, and preaching went on continually.[17]

As early as 1794, one of the Methodist churches in Lincoln County, North Carolina, had held one of these meetings in the nearby forest for several

[17] Cleveland, C. C. *The Great Revival in the West*, 1797-1805, 22, 28.

days and nights. The camp meeting was well introduced by the beginning of the next century. Excitement was intense. This was largely the result of impassioned preaching, earnest exhortation, loud prayers, and energetic singing. Bodily exercises, as dropping, jerking, and barking, often manifested themselves, but since they too often brought disrepute upon religion, they were frequently condemned by the better educated of all denominations.[18] Thousands, nevertheless, were added to the churches during this period. The Elkhorn Baptist Association of Kentucky, composed of thirty-six churches, claimed 3011 additions by baptism in the year 1801. According to a minister named Rogers, the Baptists of Kentucky received over 10,000 additions by baptism in that year alone.[19]

One of the greatest of these early meetings was the Cane Ridge Revival, 1801. The following extracts give a description of the meeting by a minister[20] who participated:

"Out of many I shall select that of Caneridge, which I attended with eighteen Presbyterian ministers and Baptists and Methodists, I do not know how many, all being either preaching or exhorting the distressed with more harmony than could be expected: The governor of our state was with us and encouraging the work. . . .

[18] Cleveland, C. C. *The Great Revival*, 1797-1805, 51-54.

[19] Woodward, W. W. *Surprising Accounts of the Revival of Religion in the United States of America*, 58, 59.

[20] A son of Rev. James Finley, and nephew of Dr. Witherspoon of New Jersey College, to whom the letter quoted was written.

not much cooperation between churches.

"The number of the people computed from 10 to 21,000 and the number of communicants 828. The whole people serious, all the conversation was of a religious nature, or calling in question the divinity of the work. Great numbers were on the ground, from Friday until the Thursday following, night and day without intermission engaged in some religious act of worship. They are commonly collected in small circles of ten or twelve, close adjoining another circle, and all engaged in singing Watts' and Harts' Hymns; and then a minister steps upon a stump or log and begins an exhortation or sermon, when as many as can hear, collect around him. On Sabbath night, I saw above one hundred candles burning at once—and I saw I suppose one hundred persons at once on the ground crying for mercy of all ages from 8 to 60 years. Some I had satisfaction in conversing with, others I had none; and this was the case with my brethren as some of them told me. When a person is struck down he is carried by others out of the congregation, when some minister converses with and prays for him, afterwards a few gather around and sing a Hymn suitable to his case. The whole number brought to the ground under convictions about one thousand, not less. The sensible, the weak, learned and unlearned, the rich and the poor are subjects of it. At Cianthiana, Paris, Flat-creek, Point Pleasant, Walnut Hill and George Town, great congregations are in all these places, and exercised in the manner as above described. . . .

"Some, perhaps, will censure us for associating with the Baptists and Methodists. But, my dear Sir, we are all very friendly; there appears to be good doing; all are encouraging it; and is this not better than to be devouring one another? Is it not more agreeable with the command of Christ, whose every precept is love? We all preach the truth, as we think, carefully observing decorum, as far as conscience will admit, that one society may not hurt the feelings of another."[21]

[21] Woodward, W. W. *Surprising Accounts of the Revival of Religion*, 225-229.

Thousands of men and women accepted Christ during this period of revival. The gains of the Baptists in Kentucky have already been indicated. The Methodists registered large additions also, as did the Presbyterians. The latter, however, regarded the methods with disfavor in some cases; hence their increase was neither so large nor so permanent as that of the others. Then, too, schisms occurred in their ranks, one of which—the Stone movement—will be considered in the following chapter.

In spite of the great interest manifested in religion from 1797 to 1805 and in the camp meetings of succeeding years, however, it must not be supposed that religious conditions in the West were entirely uniform or favorable. Morals, it is true, were fair at first. The grosser vices were unknown. Drinking had scarcely begun. In speaking of the conditions in Illinois, 1785-1800, Peck said:

> "For the first eight or ten years of the period I have glanced over, the only professor of religion in the colony was a female, who had been a member of the Presbyterian church; yet the Sabbath was observed with religious consecration. The people were accustomed to assemble, sing hymns, and read a portion of scripture or a sermon. No one ventured to offer a prayer."[22]

As time went on, nevertheless, people of a different type came in. Thus Peck in his *Diary* for Saturday evening, November 8, 1817, made the following entry:

[22] Peck, J. M. *Annals of the West*, 706.

"I stepped into a grocery where were assembled a number of wild fellows, swearing and blaspheming at a most horrid rate. I have seen enough of Shawneetown to justify what is reported of it as a most abandoned place. There are some decent, clever families; but I have conversed with none who seem decidedly religious. To-morrow will show how the Sabbath is regarded. I never saw a place more destitute of religious instruction; and yet unless very prudent measures are pursued, little good can be expected to result."[23]

A little later, Peck, who had gone on to St. Louis, declared that half of the Anglo-Americans were infidels.[24] Concerning these he said:

"This class despised and villified religion in every form, were vulgarly profane even to the worst forms of blasphemy, and poured out scoffings and contempt on the few Christians in the village. Their nightly orgies were scenes of drunkenness and profane revelry. Among the frantic rites observed were the mock celebration of the Lord's Supper, and burning the Bible. The last ceremony consisted in raking a place in the hot coals of a wood fire, and burying therein the book of God with shoutings, prayers and songs."[25]

Drinking soon became common throughout the West. Timothy Flint gave this incident from his preaching in Kentucky:

---

[23] Babcock, Rufus. *Memoir of John Mason Peck*, 76.

[24] This statement may have been due in part, at least, to the high cost of living, for it follows a complaint about the twelve dollar a month rent, the fifty cent butter, the forty cent sugar, the seventy-five cent coffee, the twelve dollar flour, the dollar and a quarter corn, the eight dollar hogs, the thirty-seven cent chickens and the fifty cent eggs.

[25] Babcock, Rufus. *Memoir of John Mason Peck*, 85-87.

"On an evening, when I performed divine service a young man had misbehaved, through intoxication. His minister, a Baptist, reproved him in the morning. He did not palliate or deny the charge; admitted that it was shameful; but said, that being a prodigal in a good and respectable family, he was subject in consequence to bitter reflection, and that, particularly the evening before, he had felt a painful sinking before he went to hear the word, and had found it necessary to take a little of the cheering juice of the grape; and that his optics, as he had often felt before, had been so disordered, that he saw things double. He ended by saying, that the minister, whom he had often seen in the same predicament, must know how to make his excuse."[26]

In order to get a general and an authentic idea of conditions in the West, the Massachusetts and Connecticut Missionary societies employed S. J. Mills and J. F. Schermerhorn "to make a tour through the Western and Southern States and Territories, preach the gospel to the destitute, explore the country, examine the moral and religious state of the people and promote the establishment of Bible societies wherever they went."[27] The two missionaries worked in Pennsylvania, new Virginia, Western Reserve, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri. They went down the Mississippi by flat boat to New Orleans, which they reached in March, 1813. The two men found great tracts of country

[26] Flint, Timothy. *Recollections of the Last Ten Years Passed in Occasional Residences and Journeyings in the Valley of the Mississippi*, 62, 63.

[27] McMaster, J. B. *A History of the People of the United States*, IV., 551.

inhabited by 20,000 to 50,000 people without a preacher of any denomination. Where ministers were found, the Methodists usually led, and the Baptists were their only competitors. The Presbyterians sent a few missionaries, but they worked for six or eight weeks only, and other sects generally received the benefit. The Presbyterian strongholds were the large villages and towns, where a small congregation was preached to by some eastern graduate, who made his living by farming, teaching, or practicing medicine. His religious duties were secondary. The missionaries considered Ohio the most respectable part of the West although it contained a greater variety of sects than any other equal area in the country. Everywhere, but especially in the Ohio River towns, they found that the Lord's Day was polluted by such things as visiting, feasting, hunting, fishing, drunkenness, and swearing. Across the river in Kentucky, the people added gambling, duelling, and horse racing. Both men described these towns as "sinks of iniquity" and the people as ignorant, vicious, and destitute of Bibles and religious books. New Orleans they regarded as the most sinful city they had ever seen. Mills declared that more actual sin was committed there on Sunday than in all the other days of the week, and that three-fourths of the people had never even seen the back of a Bible.

The next summer, Mills, accompanied by Daniel Smith, made a second trip. The two missionaries carried with them seven hundred English Bibles,

five thousand copies of the New Testament in French, fifteen thousand tracts and great bundles of sermons, all of which were contributed by the Bible and tract societies of New England and the Middle States. After covering the field a second time, Mills declared that there were in 1815, between the Allegheny Mountains and the Mississippi, 76,000 families without the Bible and that the number was increasing yearly. Since the supply sent by the Eastern societies was less than the increase of population, he stated that a mighty effort would have to be made if the West did not become as ignorant of God's word as the heart of Africa. To prevent this, on May 8, 1816, delegates from twenty-eight societies met in New York City and founded the American Bible Society. Strong opposition to this organization at once arose. Some people declared that there was no need for such a society, that it would become a party instrument to promote the interests of a particular sect, and that it would draw money away from other worthy institutions as the British and Foreign Bible Societies which Americans ought to join in place of setting up one of their own. The Episcopalians were especially bitter. Bishop White would not support it, and Bishop Hobart attacked it with zeal. In spite of opposition, however, the new organization thrived. Branch societies sprang up everywhere, reaching 239 by 1821. At that time, over 140,000 Bibles, Testaments, and parts of Testaments had been given away.

Am. B. S. 1816

The report of Mills on the condition of the blacks was even more shocking. The 1810 Census gave the number as a million and a half, the vast majority, of course, being slave. Whether slave or free, however, they were as destitute of teachers and preachers as the whites were of Bibles. The colonization movement followed.[28]

As time passed, nevertheless, the country became more settled, and improvements followed in religious affairs as well as in other things. Mrs. Trollope, describing the period some ten or fifteen years after the missionary trips recorded above, gave, notwithstanding, a rather unfavorable account of religious conditions in the West, and especially of the power of the clergy over women.[29] Harriet Martineau likewise pointed out this dangerous influence over women and superstitious men, and declared that the exclusively clerical were the worst enemies of Christianity except the vicious.[30]

The words of the former with regard to revivals, camp meetings, and cottage prayer meetings deserve considerable attention and rather copious quotations. The concluding parts of a very vivid description of a Cincinnati revival follow:

"Meanwhile the two priests continued to walk among them; they repeatedly mounted on the benches, and trumpet mouthed proclaimed to the whole congregation, 'the tidings

---

[28] McMaster, J. B. *A History of the People of the United States*, IV., 551-555.

[29] Trollope, Mrs. *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, II., 97.

[30] Martineau, Harriet. *Society in America*, III., 290-293.

of salvation,' and then from every corner of the building arose in reply, short sharp cries of 'Amen! Glory! Amen!' while the prostrate penitents continued to receive whispered comfortings, and from time to time a mystic caress. More than once I saw a young neck encircled by a reverend arm. Violent hysterics and convulsions seized many of them, and when the tumult was at the highest, the priest who remained above gave out a hymn as if to drown it.

"It was a frightful sight to behold innocent young creatures, in the gay morning of existence, thus seized upon, horror struck, and rendered feeble and enervated forever. One young girl, apparently not more than fourteen, was supported in the arms of another some years older; her face was pale as death; her eyes wide open, and perfectly devoid of meaning; her chin and bosom wet with slaver; she had every appearance of idiotism. I saw a priest approach her, he took her delicate hand. 'Jesus is with her! Bless the Lord!' he said, and passed on.

"Did the men of America value their women as men ought to value their wives and daughters, would such scenes be permitted among them?

"It is hardly necessary to say, that all who obeyed the call to themselves on the 'anxious benches' were women, and by far the greater number, very young women. The congregation was, in general, extremely well dressed, and the smartest and most fashionable ladies of the town were there; during the whole revival the churches and meeting houses were every day crowded with well dressed people.

"It is thus the ladies of Cincinnati amuse themselves; to attend the theater is forbidden; to play cards is unlawful; but they work hard in their families, and must have some relaxation. For myself, I confess that I think the coarsest comedy ever written would be a less destestable exhibition for the eyes of youth and innocence than such a scene."[31]

[31] Trollope, Mrs. *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, I., 111-113.

Very conflicting reports had come to Mrs. Trollope concerning the camp meetings. Some people had told her that being at a camp meeting was like standing at the gates of heaven and seeing them thrown open, while others had declared that it was like finding oneself within the gates of hell; hence she determined to investigate for herself. Her conclusion was not the former. After the investigation, she penned the following vivid picture of private devotions in a tent:

"Out of about thirty person thus placed, perhaps half a dozen were men. One of these, a handsome-looking youth of eighteen or twenty, kneeled just below the opening through which I looked. His arm was encircling the neck of a young girl who knelt beside him, with her hair hanging dishevelled upon her shoulders, and her features working with the most violent agitation; soon after they both fell forward on the straw, as if unable to endure in any other attitude, the burning eloquence of a tall grim figure in black, who, standing erect in the center, was uttering with incredible vehemence an oration that seemed to hover between praying and preaching; his arms hung stiff and immovable by his side, and he looked like an ill constructed machine, set in action by a movement so violent, as to threaten its own destruction, so jerkingly, painfully, yet rapidly, did his words tumble out; the kneeling circle ceased not to call, in every variety of tone, on the name of Jesus; accompanied with sobs, groans, and a sort of low howling, inexpressibly painful to listen to. But my attention was speedily withdrawn from the preacher, and the circle round him, by a figure which knelt alone at some distance; it was a living image of Scott's Macbriar, as young, as wild, and as terrible. His thin arms tossed above his head, had forced themselves so far out of the sleeves, that they were bare to the elbow; his large

eyes glared frightfully, and he continued to scream without an instant's intermission the word 'Glory' with a violence that seemed to swell every vein to bursting. It was too dreadful to look upon long, and we turned away shuddering."[32]

After describing a tent meeting of the negroes, our religious critic turned her attention to the general gathering, a scene which she described as the pen at midnight. She said:

"Many of these wretched creatures were beautiful young females. The preachers moved among them, at once exciting and soothing their agonies. I heard the muttered 'Sister, dear sister!' I saw the insidious lips approach the cheeks of the unhappy girls; I heard the murmured confessions of the poor victims, and I watched their tormentors, breathing into their ears, consolations that tinged the pale cheeks with red. Had I been a man, I am sure I should have been guilty of some rash act of interference; nor do I believe that such a scene could have been acted in the presence of Englishmen without instant punishment being inflicted; not to mention the salutary discipline of the treadmill, which, beyond all question, would in England have been applied to check so turbulent and vicious a scene."[33]

Mrs. Trollope next remarked that at breakfast time she recognized many a fair but pale face, which she knew was a demoniac of the night before, now simpering beside some swain, for whom the erstwhile enthusiast carefully provided hot coffee and eggs. The writer ironically continued: "We soon after left the ground; but before our depart-

[32] Trollope, Mrs. *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, I., 235-237.
[33] *Ibid.*, I., 241, 242.

ure we learnt that a very *satisfactory* collection had been made by the preachers, for Bibles, Tracts and *all other religious purposes.*"[34]

The same author referred to the prayer-meetings, which, she said, outsiders would regard as parties. The meetings, according to her, were solemnized by the best rooms, the best dresses, and the choicest refreshments. She declared that there was a very close resemblance between the feelings of Presbyterian and Methodist ladies who were fortunate enough to secure a favorite itinerant and those of a "London Blue" who was equally blest with the presence of a fashionable poet.[35] Her description of one of these cottage prayer gatherings is particularly good, though rather figurative:

"We were received with great attention, and a place was assigned us on one of the benches that surrounded the little parlor. Several persons, looking like mechanics and their wives, were present; every one sat in profound silence, and with that quiet subdued air that serious people assume on entering a church. At length, a long, black, grimlooking man entered; his dress, the cut of his hair, and his whole appearance, strongly recalled the idea of one of Cromwell's fanatics. He stepped solemnly into the middle of the room, and took a chair that stood there, but not to sit upon it; he turned the back towards him, on which he placed his hands, and stoutly uttering a sound between a hem and a cough, he deposited freely on either side of him a considerable portion of masticated tobacco. He then began to preach. His text was 'Live in hope,' and he continued to expound it for two hours in a drawling, nasal tone, with no

[34] Trollope, Mrs. *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, I., 244, 245.
[35] *Ibid.*, I., 105, 106.

other respite than what he allowed himself for expectoration. If I say that he uttered the words of his text a hundred times, I shall not exceed the truth, for that allows more than a minute for each repetition, and in fact the whole discourse was made up of it. The various tones in which he uttered it might have served as a lesson on emphasis; as a question—in accents of triumph—in accents of despair—of pity—of threatening—of authority—of doubt—of hope—of faith. Having exhausted every imaginable variety of tone, he abruptly said, 'Let us pray,' and twisting his chair round, knelt before it. Every one knelt before the seat they had occupied, and listened for another half hour to a rant of miserable, low, familiar jargon, that he presumed to *improvise* to his Maker as a prayer. In this, however, the cottage apostle only followed the example set by every preacher throughout the Union, excepting those of the Episcopalian and Catholic congregations; they only do not deem themselves privileged to address the Deity in strains of crude and unweighed importunity. These ranters may sometimes be very much in earnest, but surely the least we can say of it is that they 'Praise their God amiss.' ''[36]

Conditions, of course, were better in the older states. Depravity and crime, it is true, were still too common all over the Union in 1830, but in most communities religion then ranked second to getting a living in importance. The Congregational Church was not disestablished in Massachusetts until 1835, and a rather severe type of piety was yet common in all of New England. Sunday was indeed a period of carousal and cockfighting to certain elements, but to most respectable people it was a serious day, observed by a morning and an afternoon

[36] Trollope, Mrs. *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, I., 176-178.

sermon. Some vicinities also had a Thursday lecture, which was a third sermon. Prayer meetings, conference meetings, class meetings, and love feasts were frequently added. By 1830 the Bible School was making its way throughout the country. It was not the place of ease it now is, however, for the children were expected to learn weekly and recite not less than ten verses of Scripture. All were encouraged in feats of Biblical memory.

A. B. Hart, in commenting on this period, said:

> "In this day of many interests and few enthusiasms it is hard to realize the immense force of religion and religious organizations upon the minds of the people. 'Hell' and 'brimstone' preaching was still common. Revivalists like Finney and Nettleton preached the tortures of damned souls until people shrieked and dropped fainting in their pews."[37]

Whether because of this type of preaching or for some other reason, all the churches seemed touched, nevertheless, with a new feeling of responsibility to humanity, and sincere efforts were made to make religion effective, to apply it to all moral questions, and to make individuals and community correspond to the principles of Christianity. This passionate desire to "rescue the perishing" and to elevate community standards led directly to reform legislation, such as the movement against the excessive use of intoxicating liquors, begun in 1817, widened by the Washington organizations in

[37] *Slavery and Abolition*, 13.

1830, and still later developed into state prohibition.[38]

Although the movement dealt with in this book, like the Unitarian and Universalist movements, was a revolt against the narrow exclusiveness of certain religious views, the people in the older states and in the rapidly growing young states were not noted for their tolerance. Indeed, intolerance may be mentioned as a striking characteristic of the period. Timothy Flint pointed out the prevailing narrowness of spirit among believers.[39] Harriet Martineau commented on the same thing:

"A religious young Christian legislator was pitied, blamed, and traduced in Boston, last year, by clergymen, lawyers, and professors of a college, for endeavoring to obtain a repeal of the law under which the testimony of speculative atheists is rejected in courts of justice: Quakers (calling themselves Friends) excommunicate each other: Presbyterian clergymen preach hatred to Catholics: a convent is burnt and the nuns are banished from the neighborhood: and Episcopalian clergymen claim credit for admitting Unitarians to sit in committees for public objects."[40]

Newspapers frequently referred to this illiberality. Thus one editor wrote:

"Summary Process. In looking over a *religious* newspaper published in Philadelphia, which accidentally came into our possession—we thought that it was a very efficient way to dispose of political or religious opponents, by consigning them all to the 'devil,' or his 'friends,' in the plenitude

[38] Hart, A. B. *Slavery and Abolition*, 12-15.
[39] *Recollections of the Last Ten Years*, 114.
[40] *Society in America*, III., 227.

of one's own power! To be sure—it is not very modest, or kind, or liberal, or charitable—but what else is there for a devil if *infallible* man may not command his services?''[41]

An editorial in the same paper, three years later, read in part as follows:

''Religious Newspapers and Controversies. We have 'fallen upon evil times.' Indeed it would almost seem that a return to the 'days of fire and faggot' might be speedily looked for—if the secular power could be rendered subservient to the propagation and 'glorious progress' of some of the leading *Christian* sects. Concerning such quarrels (which then existed as now though with a better excuse than at present), Franklin about sixty years ago, said in a private letter to a friend:

1833.

''' 'When theologians or religious people quarrel about religion, each party abuses the other; the profane and the infidel believe both sides and enjoy the fray; the reputation of religion in general suffers and its enemies are ready to say, not what was said in primitive times, *behold how these Christians love one another,* but *mark how these Christians hate one another.*'

''And when we refer to certain newspapers in which 'the drum ecclesiastic' is most loudly and wickedly beaten—with rub-a-dub here, and rub-a-dub there—it may well be said—'mark how these Christians hate one another.'

''There have been regular settos between wrangling priests—whose zeal was manifestly greater 'to floor their antagonists,—and, by cart-loads of Latin and Greek and Hebrew,' 'with' or 'without points,' send each other into the safe and fast keeping of 'the prince of devils,' and gather laurels for themselves—outrageously and indecently inconsistent with the sublime principles of that religion which teaches meekness and forbearance and 'peace and good will to all men.'

[41] *Niles Register,* August 14, 1830.

". . . . But we have been disgusted in too many of the *religious* newspapers, and would enter an humble, but earnest protest against them all, saying, 'Let there be peace between you.'"[42]

In spite of these statements on the prevailing intolerance, however, breaches had begun to appear in the stern religious views with the opening of the new century. The struggle of the narrow element was hard, and complete victory for the liberals was long postponed, yet, nevertheless, Henry Adams has well written:

"The spread of great popular sects like the Universalists and Campbellites, founded on assumptions such as no Orthodox theology could tolerate, showed a growing tendency to relaxation of thought in that direction. The struggle for existence was already mitigated, and the first effect of the change was seen in the increasing cheerfulness of religion."[43]

The growth of churches during the period under consideration is of interest. Apparently for the year 1810, Timothy Dwight estimated the number of churches in Massachusetts as 531, in Maine 221, in New Hampshire 160, in Connecticut 355, and in Vermont as at least 154. Of this number, over half or 843 out of 1421 were Presbyterian or Congregational. Of the total number, 385 were Baptist and forty-five Methodist. Only one of the latter was reported in New Hampshire and one in Vermont, while not a single church of that denomination was located in Connecticut. The Presbyterian

[42] *Niles Register*, August 8, 1833.
[43] *History of the United States*, IX., 239.

churches were good, but the buildings of the Baptists, with a few exceptions, and those of the Methodists, were not. The congregations of the latter, like their buildings, were generally small, and their ministers, according to Dwight, were usually uneducated.[44] In 1817, however, the number of Methodists in the United States was estimated at 224,853, while the number of Baptists was 183,245.[45]

Six years later there were seven hundred Congregational churches in New England alone, and over 1400 Presbyterian churches in the United States with some 100,000 communicants. The Episcopalians then had about seven hundred churches, the Baptists over 2300, and the Methodists more than 2500, while the Universalists possessed about two hundred separate societies and the Catholics one hundred. In all, there were, in 1823, about 8000 places of worship, 5000 ministers, and a dozen theological seminaries.[46] Eight years later, the number of churches was over 12,000. The Baptists and Methodists had 4484 between them, the Presbyterians 1472, the Congregationalists 1381, the Episcopalians 922, and the Roman Catholics 784.[47]

A few years afterwards, Harriet Martineau declared that in 1835 there were 15,477 churches with only 12,130 ministers. The leading sects were ranked by her as follows: Episcopalian Methodists,

[44] *Travels in New England and New York*, 443-447.
[45] *Niles Register*, August 28, 1817.
[46] *Ibid.*, November 22, 1823.
[47] *Ibid.*, September 3, 1831.

Catholics, Calvinistic Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Christians, Episcopalians, and Quakers.[48] The following figures for the next year estimated the number of people supposed to be in sympathy with the various churches:

Baptists	4,300,000	Christian	300,000
Methodists	3,000,000	Friends	230,000
Presbyterian	2,175,000	Unitarians	180,000
Congregationalists	1,400,000	Mormonites	12,000
Roman Catholics	800,000	Tunkers	30,000
Episcopalians	600,000	Shakers	6,000
Lutherans	540,000	Moravians	5,575
Dutch Reformed	450,000	Swedenborgians	4,000[49]

These figures were probably exaggerated, for the estimates of 1843 showed little change except to register an increase of 500,000 for the Catholics, 400,000 for the Episcopalians, and minor increases for other organizations.[50]

The above figures, as previously mentioned, include the sympathizers. The following statistics for the three popular churches—Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian—represent actual church members:

Methodists:

Episcopal Church	1,157,249
Protestant	60,000
Reformed	3,000
Wesleyan	20,000
German (United Brethren)	15,000
	1,255,249

[48] *Society in America*, III., 272, 273.
[49] *Niles Register*, July 2, 1836.
[50] *Ibid.*, February 11, 1843.

Baptists:	
Baptists	638,279
Anti-Mission	69,668
Six Principle	3,055
Seventh Day	6,077
Free Will	61,372
Church of God	10,000
Christian	175,000
Christian Connection	35,000
	998,451
Presbyterian:	
Old School Presbyterians	166,487
New	120,645
Cumberland	60,000
Associate, Reformed and All Other	45,500
Orthodox Congregationalist	202,250
Dutch Reformed	31,214
German Reformed	75,600
	701,696

Other churches increased the total membership to 4,181,292, or not quite one half the adult population over twenty-one years of age.[51]

In 1850 and 1860, the leading denominations ranked as follows in number of churches:

	1850	1860	Gain Per Cent.
Methodist	13,280	19,883	49
Baptist	9,375	12,150	30
Presbyterian	4,824	6,406	33
Congregationalist	1,706	2,234	30
Episcopalian	1,459	2,145	47
Catholic	1,221	2,550	108

[51] *Niles Register*, January 18, 1845.

Lutheran	1,217	2,128	75
Christian	853	2,068	154
All Churches	38,061	54,009	41

The leaders in church accommodations then ranked as follows:

	1850	1860	Gain Per Cent.
Methodist	4,343,579	6,259,799	44
Baptist	3,247,029	4,044,220	24
Presbyterian	2,079,690	2,565,949	23
Congregationalist	801,835	956,351	19
Catholic	667,823	1,404,437	110
Episcopalian	643,598	847,296	32
Lutheran	534,250	757,637	42
Christian	300,005	681,016	127

From the preceding table, it will be apparent that only two churches—the Catholic and Christian —more than doubled. The others, however, made substantial gains. The total seating accommodations increased 34 per cent, or from 14,234,825 to 19,128,751, but the Methodists and Catholics alone registered over half of this gain.

The ranking in the value of church property was:

	1850	1860	Gain Per Cent.
Methodist	$14,822,870	$33,093,371	123
Presbyterian	14,543,789	26,840,525	84
Episcopalian	11,375,010	21,665,698	90
Baptist	11,020,855	21,079,114	91
Catholic	9,256,758	26,774,119	189
Congregationalist	7,970,195	13,327,511	67
Dutch Reformed	4,096,880	4,453,850	9
Unitarian	3,173,822	4,338,316	37

	1850	1860	Gain Per Cent.
Lutheran	$2,854,286	$5,385,179	89
Universalist	1,752,316	2,856,095	63
Friends	1,713,767	2,544,507	48
German Reformed	975,080	2,422,670	148
Christian	847,036	2,518,045	197

The total value of church property practically doubled, or increased from $87,328,801 to $171,598,432. By dividing the value of the church property by the number of churches the following average valuations are obtained:

	1850	1860	Gain Per Cent.
Methodist	$ 1,116.17	$ 1,664.40	49
Presbyterian	3,014.88	4,189.90	39
Episcopalian	7,796.44	10,100.55	30
Baptist	1,175.56	1,734.90	48
Catholic	7,581.29	10,499.65	38
Congregationalist	4,671.86	5,965.76	27
Dutch Reformed	12,414.78	10,122.38	Loss
Unitarian	13,114.97	16,433.01	25
Lutheran	2,345.35	2,530.63	8
Universalist	3,312.50	4,301.34	30
Friends	2,360.56	3,504.83	48
German Reformed	2,884.85	3,583.83	24
Christian	993.00	1,217.62	23
Average—all churches.	2,294.44	3,173.51	38 [52]

From these figures, it will be noticed that the Christian, Baptist, and Methodist churches have spent less money for their buildings; hence it may be supposed that most of their members were in

[52] *Census*, 1850, LV.-LVII., and *Eighth Census, Mortality and Miscellaneous Statistics*, 497-501, supplied information for the preparation of these tables.

the newer parts of the country, and such was the case. The older churches had their main strength in the East. The principal gains in the country were naturally in the West. During the decade, the number of churches in the Mississippi Valley increased to 28,800, a gain of 10,500; the increase in the rest of the country was only 5,400. The gain in the value of church property in the Valley was $33,800,000; in the rest of the country, $50,-154,000. Church accommodations in the Valley increased from 6,400,000 to 9,700,000, a gain of 3,300,000 sittings, while in the rest of the country the gain was only 1,591,000.[53]

The growth of four of these churches—the Christian, Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian—in certain western states during the decade 1850-1860 is brought out by the following tables:

	Churches		Gain	Seating		Gain
	1850	1860	Per	Accommodations		Per
Ohio			Cent.	1850	1860	Cent.
Christian	90	365	305	30,190	124,080	311
Baptist	551	564	2	185,673	196,085	5
Methodist	1,529	2,341	53	543,090	828,843	52
Presbyterian	663	749	13	272,274	312,375	15

	Value of Property		
	1850	1860	Gain Per Cent.
Christian	$ 56,155	$ 430,105	666
Baptist	621,730	1,021,820	64
Methodist	1,545,831	3,508,135	126
Presbyterian	1,389,699	2,595,844	86

[53] Walker, C. B. *The Mississippi Valley*, 361.

	Churches 1850	Churches 1860	Gain Per Cent.	Seating Accommodations 1850	Seating Accommodations 1860	Gain Per Cent.
Indiana						
Christian	187	347	85	65,341	125,600	92
Baptist	428	502	17	138,783	174,610	25
Methodist	778	1,256	61	266,372	432,160	62
Presbyterian	282	328	16	105,582	125,265	18

	Value of Property 1850	1860	Gain Per Cent.
Christian	$ 89,790	$ 270,515	201
Baptist	212,735	455,860	114
Methodist	492,560	1,345,935	173
Presbyterian	326,520	699,285	114

	Churches 1850	Churches 1860	Gain Per Cent.	Seating Accommodations 1850	Seating Accommodations 1860	Gain Per Cent.
Illinois						
Christian	69	148	114	30,864	44,850	45
Baptist	282	455	61	94,130	130,770	38
Methodist	405	881	117	178,452	267,218	49
Presbyterian	206	360	74	83,129	128,932	55

	Value of Property 1850	1860	Gain Per Cent.
Christian	$ 42,950	$ 193,700	351
Baptist	204,095	752,695	268
Methodist	327,640	1,718,135	424
Presbyterian	395,130	1,233,760	212

	Churches 1850	Churches 1860	Gain Per Cent.	Seating Accommodations 1850	Seating Accommodations 1860	Gain Per Cent.
Missouri						
Christian	57	150	163	19,655	54,100	175
Baptist	300	457	52	73,525	141,515	92
Methodist	250	526	110	60,944	150,160	146
Presbyterian	125	225	80	44,820	77,855	73

	Value of Property		
	1850	1860	Gain Per Cent.
Christian	$ 43,210	$ 203,800	371
Baptist	154,480	573,260	271
Methodist	280,245	959,125	242
Presbyterian	285,970	755,325	164

	Churches		Gain	Seating Accommodations		Gain
	1850	1860	Per Cent.	1850	1860	Per Cent.
Kentucky						
Christian	111	304	174	46,340	104,980	126
Baptist	803	788	Loss	291,855	267,860	Loss
Methodist	530	666	26	167,485	228,100	36
Presbyterian	224	250	11	99,106	99,175	....

	Value of Property		
	1850	1860	Gain Per Cent.
Christian	$ 164,925	$ 499,810	203
Baptist	570,505	888,530	55
Methodist	460,755	808,305	75
Presbyterian	491,303	720,825	46

	Churches		Gain	Seating Accommodations		Gain
	1850	1860	Per Cent.	1850	1860	Per Cent.
Tennessee						
Christian	59	106	79	18,350	35,100	91
Baptist	646	682	5	195,315	214,381	9
Methodist	861	992	15	249,053	288,460	15
Presbyterian	363	431	18	135,517	159,800	18

	Value of Property		
	1850	1860	Gain Per Cent.
Christian	$ 48,295	$ 94,720	96
Baptist	271,899	499,610	84
Methodist	381,711	763,655	100
Presbyterian	367,081	785,780	114

	Churches		Gain	Seating Accommodations		Gain
	1850	1860	Per Cent.	1850	1860	Per Cent.
Virginia						
Christian	16	73	356	4,900	24,085	391
Baptist	649	828	27	247,589	317,504	28
Methodist	1,025	1,403	37	323,708	438,244	35
Presbyterian	240	300	25	103,625	120,404	16

	Value of Property		
	1850	1860	Gain Per Cent.
Christian	$ 7,595	$ 72,500	854
Baptist	688,518	1,282,430	86
Methodist	725,003	1,619,000	123
Presbyterian	571,165	921,095	61

	Churches		Gain	Seating Accommodations		Gain
	1850	1860	Per Cent.	1850	1860	Per Cent.
Pennsylvania						
Christian	21	69	228	6,900	21,960	218
Baptist	320	610	90	128,458	219,779	71
Methodist	889	1,573	76	341,551	547,782	60
Presbyterian	775	997	28	359,966	431,763	19

	Value of Property		
	1850	1860	Gain Per Cent.
Christian	$ 24,400	$ 115,240	372
Baptist	811,195	1,693,061	108
Methodist	1,726,038	3,669,953	112
Presbyterian	2,585,250	4,835,760	87 [54]

From the above tables, it will be noticed that the Christian church registered the largest gain in every state save one, Illinois, where the Methodists led by about three per cent. The increase

[54] This table was compiled from the *Census Reports* for 1850 and 1860. When divisions had occurred within the churches, the totals were taken in order to get a comparison.

among the Disciples in Virginia and Pennsylvania was largely in the western parts, or the less densely settled regions. The Baptists apparently suffered most from the Disciple gains. Thus they ran lowest in increase of churches in Ohio, Illinois, Missouri and Tennessee, while in Kentucky they suffered an actual loss. The Presbyterians gained in every state, but they showed the smallest increase in Indiana, Kentucky, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. Earlier tables point out that the average value of the church buildings of the Disciples of Christ was less than that of any other of the leading churches, another proof that the Disciple strength was in the newer communities. The increase in church accommodations and the value of church property furnishes still another proof. Gains like those of Virginia and Ohio,—854 per cent and 666 per cent in the value of property,—more than double the increase in number of churches and seating accommodations, however, show the rise in price of property caused by continued growth in population. The origin and growth of this church, commonly called "Christian" but more correctly "Disciples of Christ," a product of the American frontier and an organization which registered a larger growth than any other church in the United States during the decade 1850-1860, will be the subject of the following pages.

II

PRELIMINARY MOVEMENTS

THE origin of the Disciples of Christ was more or less closely connected with that of a body of believers commonly known as the Christian Connection, but owning only the simple designation of "The Christians"; hence it will be necessary to consider briefly this body. The Christian Connection had its beginning in the early part of the nineteenth century through the union of three distinct movements: (1) one in which James O'Kelly, a prominent Methodist minister of Virginia was the leader; (2) another in which Abner Jones, an influential Baptist preacher of Vermont, was conspicuous; and (3) a movement growing out of the Great Revival in Kentucky in which Barton W. Stone and other Presbyterian clergy played a leading role. These three movements, in widely separated parts of the country, each independent and unknown to leaders of the others until 1806, were alike in taking the Bible as the only rule of faith and in rejecting Calvinism.[1]

The first of these currents, in point of time, was that of O'Kelly in Virginia and North Carolina.

[1] Carroll, H. K. *The Religious Forces of the United States*, 91, 92.

James O'Kelly seems to have been a man of great personal magnetism and the popular idol of many of his frontier parishioners. He was a man of strong likes and dislikes, and of high personal ambitions. Nevertheless, since he had thoroughly imbibed the democratic ideals of Revolutionary times, he was desirous of seeing those principles extended to the church government. In other words, he was decidedly out of sympathy with, if not openly hostile to, the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church. MacClenny, O'Kelly's biographer, after discussing the history of that church, declared:

> "We may now sum up the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America from 1784 to 1792, and say that it was without even so much as a semblance of a constitution, and during this time there was but one law and that was: The will of Mr. Francis Asbury. This Mr. O'Kelly could not endure, for in the heat of the struggle for civil liberty he had shouldered his musket, and fought and suffered imprisonment in order that he might with others be rid of tyranny and oppression, and now he was not willing to be oppressed in ecclesiastical matters by any man, unless he might have some means of redress."[2]

In support of this view, MacClenny quoted an undated letter from O'Kelly to Colonel Hollowell Williams, of Currituck County, North Carolina. Williams had been a member of the North Carolina Constitutional Convention of 1776, and he still was a leading Methodist. In the letter, apparently written about 1795, O'Kelly said:

[2] MacClenny, W. *The Life of Rev. James O'Kelly*, 79, 80.

"No doubt you have heard I had resigned my place in the conference. I protested against a consolidated government, or any one lord or archbishop, claiming apostolic authority, declaring to have the keys. Thus our ministry have raised a throne for bishops, which being a human invention, a deviation from Christ and dear Mr. Wesley, I cordially refuse to touch. Liberty is worth contending for at the point of the sword in divers ways—monarchy, tyranny tumbling both in church and kingdom—while our preachers are erecting a throne for gentlemen bishops, in a future day, when fixed with an independent fortune, they may sit and lord it over God's heritage."[3]

O'Kelly's opposition, whether due to an unfaltering belief in democratic principles, disappointed ambition, or impending fear that he would be tried on the question of orthodoxy[4] culminated at the Baltimore Conference of 1793. At this meeting, he made the proposal that

"after the bishop appoints the preachers at a conference to their several circuits, if any one think himself injured by the appointment, he shall have liberty to appeal to the conference and state his objections; and if the conference approve his objections, the bishop shall appoint him to another circuit."[5]

The democratic spirit was so thoroughly at work that a large majority at first appeared to be in

---

[3] MacClenny, W. *The Life of Rev. James O'Kelly*, 207.

[4] He had been accused of denying and preaching against the doctrine of the Trinity, by saying that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were characters, and not persons, that these characters all belonged to Jesus Christ, and that Christ was the Father, Son and Holy Ghost (Stevens, Abel. *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, III., 26, 27).

[5] Buckley, J. M. *History of Methodism*, I., 339.

favor of the motion, but one of the members, John Dickens, moved to divide the question thus: (1) Shall the bishop appoint the preachers to the circuits? (2) Shall a preacher be allowed an appeal? The first question was carried without a dissenting voice. On the second, however, a difficulty at once arose—Shall this be considered a new rule or only an amendment to an old rule? If it were regarded as a new rule, a two-thirds vote would be necessary; otherwise, a simple majority would suffice. After some debate the conference decided that the motion was merely an amendment to an old rule. The Methodist regulations allowed every member to speak three times on each motion, if he desired. Many so chose, and the debate lasted three or four days before the vote was taken.

The arguments advanced in favor of the motion are rather interesting because they clearly show, both in scope and in passion, the influence of American and French revolutionary thought. The radical friends of the appeal maintained that it was a shame for a man to accept such lordship, and even more so to claim it, and that any man who would submit to such absolute dominion would forfeit all claims to freedom and ought to have his ears bored through with an awl, be fastened to his master's door, and become a slave for life. One of the speakers, not quite so extreme as certain others, held that to be denied an appeal was an insult to a man's understanding, and a species of tyranny to which others might submit if they chose, but for

his part he must be excused for saying that he could not.[6]

On the other hand, the enemies of the motion were more dispassionate and argumentative. They declared that Wesley, the father of the Methodist family, had formed the plan, and deemed it essential to the preservation of the itinerancy. "According to you, Mr. O'Kelly," they argued, "Wesley ought to blush, if he were alive, for he claimed the right to station preachers until the day of his death." Perhaps the strongest argument advanced in opposition, however, was the impracticability of the appeal. Should one minister appeal and the conference sustain his request, the bishop would have to remove some one else to make room for him. The second might appeal in his turn, and again the first might appeal from his new appointment. Moreover, others whose positions successive alterations would interrupt might appeal in turn. The calm, dispassionate arguments of the conservatives won, and the motion was defeated by a large majority.[7]

The defeated members, nevertheless, refused to abide by the decision. The next morning the Conference received a letter from them, saying that because an appeal from the decision of a superintendent in the making of appointments was not to

1793

[6] Buckley, J. M. *History of Methodism*, I., 339-341, and Stevens, Abel. *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, III., 23, 24.

[7] Stevens, Abel. *History of Methodist Episcopal Church . . .*, III., 23-25.

be allowed, they could no longer sit with that body. A committee of three was at once appointed to treat with the seceders. Bishop Coke also interviewed O'Kelly, but the combined influence of his former co-workers was insufficient, and the Irish leader, accompanied by several other preachers, set off for Virginia. Immediately after the conference adjourned, Asbury hastened to the center of conflict. O'Kelly had already persuaded William McKendree and several other ministers to refuse to go to their appointments, but by wise management Asbury effected a compromise, which included a proposition to give O'Kelly his former salary as presiding elder, provided he would stop exciting divisions. The fiery seceder at first accepted, but soon relinquished the appropriation.[8]

This secession movement injured the Methodist Church. Even Methodist writers freely admit the loss. Thus Stevens wrote:

"In the years of its greatest influence, 1793-4-5, there was a clear loss in membership of 7352. But, although this loss was so great, there is no reason to believe 'The Republican Methodists,' as they were then called, had met with corresponding success. It has been the aim of some writers to show that there were numerous accessions to Methodism during this period, and that the loss of the church was so much greater in proportion to the amount of these accessions; and that therefore the gain of O'Kelly was proportionally great. But this argument is unsupported by facts we have been able to discover."[9]

[8] Buckley, J. M. *History of Methodism*, I., 341, 342.
[9] *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, III., 34, 35.

Again, the same author said, in referring to the years 1792-1796: "Its aggregate membership shows a loss, since 1792, of more than nine thousand; it had been losing for three years, the effect of the O'Kelly schism; but substantially, it had never been more vigorous or more progressive."[10] Another writer, J. M. Buckley, likewise pointed out the decrease. He wrote:

"The secession of O'Kelly reached its height in 1795, and combined with other impediments, caused a decrease of 4673 members among the whites, which augmented by a decrease of 1644 among the colored, made a net loss of nearly 6500. There was, however, an increase of 32 preachers."[11]

M. T. Morrill, a recognized writer of the Christian Denomination, declared that the Methodists lost 3670 communicants during the first year of the schism.[12] MacClenny, the biographer of O'Kelly, as might be expected, made strong statements with regard to results. He said:

"As to the popularity of the movement, we may judge by a comparison of the returns of the Methodist Church from his old district where his influence was greatest, that the people generally liked the new organization far better than they did the old. The year after the Lebanon Conference the number of communicants in the Methodist Church of Virginia decreased 3670, and a writer said 'they began to feel the effects of the division caused by the incessant efforts of James O'Kelly, and his followers.' The Methodist returns for 1797 showed a decrease of 300 white members; in 1798,

[10] *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, III., 346.
[11] *History of Methodism*, I., 346.
[12] *History of the Christian Denomination of America*, 92.

with sixty-three preachers on Virginia soil ,and five hundred and forty members added from revivals, there was a small decrease. In 1799, the decrease was 336 whites and 120 blacks. These decreases occurred notwithstanding the fact that the Methodists marshaled all their forces against the Christian Church, and were continually holding revivals in this section, and doing aggressive missionary work, and organizing new churches among the frontier settlements."[13]

The seceders faced the problem of bringing about an effective organization. Among their numbers, the two political parties were represented, and the contest between the Republicans and Federalists became strenuous and exciting. The former prevailed, and O'Kelly formed a church with the title of Republican Methodist. Many religious organizations joined the new movement, and the resulting disputes over church property became distressing.[14] The term "Republican Methodist," however, was not retained long, although O'Kelly's idea of a "republican, no-slavery, glorious church" was maintained.[15] The first term of the original name was chosen because the church was to be run on Republican principles, all to stand on an equal footing, and each to have a voice in the government.[16]

1794 "Rep Meth"

The earliest important meeting of the new organization was held in the "Old Lebanon Church," Surrey County, Virginia, in August,

[13] *The Life of Rev. James O'Kelly*, 123, 124.
[14] Buckley, J. M. *History of Methodism*, I., 342, 343.
[15] Morrill, M. T. *History of the Christian Denomination*, 92.
[16] MacClenny, W. *The Life of Rev. James O'Kelly*, 116.

1794. It was attended by about twenty ministers, representing a constituency of one thousand people.[17] The two key notes of the movement were sounded here. Rice Haggard stood up with a copy of the New Testament in his hand and said: "Brethren, this is a sufficient rule of faith and practice, and by it we are told that the disciples were called Christians, [18] and I moved that henceforth and forever the followers of Christ be known as Christians simply."[19] The motion was unanimously adopted. A Mr. Hafferty of North Carolina then moved to take the Bible itself as their only creed, and this too was carried.[20] The new church emphasized in particular the following points:

1. The Lord Jesus Christ is the only head of the church.

2. The name Christian shall be used to the exclusion of all party and sectarian names.

3. The Holy Bible, or the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, is our only creed, and a sufficient rule of faith and practice.

4. Christian character, or vital piety, shall be the only test of church fellowship and membership.

5. The right of private judgment and the liberty of conscience are the privilege and duty of all.[21]

Immediately after this meeting, O'Kelly, Haggard, Gurrey, R. Barrett, John Robinson, Jeter,

[17] Morrill, M. T. *History of the Christian Denomination*, 92.
[18] *Acts* 11: 26.
[19] MacClenny, W. *The Life of Rev. James O'Kelly*, 116.
[20] *Ibid.*, 117.
[21] *Ibid.*, 116-122.

Reeves, and other companions began a vigorous and successful propagation of their views, especially in southern Virginia and contiguous parts of North Carolina. Affairs, nevertheless, did not always go smoothly in the new organization.[22] Buckley declared:

> "The church divided upon the name, and some proposed to call themselves the Christian church; others objected holding that this would imply that there were no Christians but of their own party. Finally several of his preachers seceded, and in less than ten years they became so divided and subdivided that it was hard to find two of one opinion."[23]

Morrill admitted trouble thus: "Things did not always move smoothly in the new denomination, and divisions later arose over baptism and kindred topics."[24]

The second of these important preliminary movements arose in New England a few years after the O'Kelly division. It was, however, entirely independent of the Methodist schism of the South. In 1800, Abner Jones, a Baptist of Vermont became greatly disturbed "in regard to sectarian names and human creeds."[25] In September, 1802, he organized a church of twenty-five members at

[22] Morrill, M. T. *History of the Christian Denomination*, 92.

[23] *History of Methodism*, I., 343.

[24] *History of the Christian Denomination*, 92. J. F. Burnett, in *The Origin and Principles of the Christians*, page 17, says that O'Kelly was a strong believer in sprinkling as the Bible mode of baptism, and as late as 1809, taught that baptism by sprinkling should be the rule of the new church to the exclusion of all other modes.

[25] Newman, A. H. *A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*, 502.

Lyndon, Vermont. The same year a second church was formed at Bradford. Jones formed another church at Hanover, New Hampshire, in 1802, and in March, 1803, still another at Piermont, in the same state. Elias Smith, likewise a Baptist of great popularity, was then preaching with much success in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. His views were similar to those of Jones; hence the church under his charge was led to adopt the same principles. In 1805, Smith began the publication of the *Christian Magazine*, which, in 1808, gave way to the *Herald of Gospel Liberty*. The latter, under different names, has continued until the present day.[26] Within a few years, by persistent propaganda, the new party had succeeded in forming organizations in most or all of the New England States, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.[27]

Barton W. Stone, the leader in the last and the most important of these preliminary movements, was born near Port Tobacco, Maryland, December 24, 1772.[28] He received his education at Guilford Academy, and embraced Christianity among the Presbyterians. With regard to his conversion, Stone afterwards wrote:

"According to the preaching, and the experience of the pious in those days, I anticipated a long and painful struggle before I should be prepared to come to Christ, or, in the

[26] Burnett, J. F. *Origin and Principles of the Christians*, 19, also Tyler, B. B. *History of the Disciples of Christ*, 30.

[27] Newman, A. H. *History of the Baptist Churches*, 502.

[28] *The Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone, Written by Himself*, 1.

language then used, before I should get religion. This anticipation was completely realized by me. For one year I was tossed on the waves of uncertainty—laboring, praying, and striving to obtain saving faith—sometimes desponding and almost despairing of ever getting it.''[29]

Peace came to him through William Hodge's sermon, ''God is love.'' Stone later studied theology under Hodge.[30] For nearly two years he was employed as professor of languages in a Methodist Academy near Washington, Georgia. This position he resigned in 1796, and soon thereafter he was licensed by the Orange Presbytery of North Carolina, and went to Tennessee. Later he settled as preacher of the congregations of Caneridge and Concord, in Bourbon County, Kentucky. In the fall of 1798, he received a call from these united congregations, and a day was appointed for his ordination. Stone, however, was in difficulty because he did not accept the doctrine of the Trinity as taught in the Confession. The following question was asked him in Presbytery, ''Do you receive and adopt the Confession of Faith, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Bible?'' to which he replied, ''I do, as far as I see it consistent with the word of God.''[31] Since no objection was raised to this answer, he was ordained.

Throughout the whole of this early period, Stone was bothered by Calvinistic speculations. He

[29] *The Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone, Written by Himself*, 9.
[30] *Ibid.*, 10-12.
[31] *Ibid.*, 16-30.

once voiced his feelings by remarking to a friend, "So great is my love for sinners, that had I power I would save them all."[33] He finally reached the conclusion, however, that God did love the whole world, but that he did not save some because of their unbelief.[33] Concerning Calvinism as a system, Stone wrote:

> "Let me here speak when I shall be lying under the clods of the grave. Calvinism is among the heaviest clogs on Christianity in the world. It is a dark mountain between heaven and earth, and is amongst the most discouraging hindrances to sinners from seeking the kingdom of God, and engenders bondage and gloominess to the saints. Its influence is felt throughout the Christian world, even where it is least suspected. Its first link is total depravity yet are there thousands of precious saints in this system."[34]

Stone was not alone in preaching that God is love, and that He is willing to save now. Other ministers joined him, among them being: Richard McNemar, John Thompson, John Dunlavy, and Robert Marshall. The Synod at Lexington was, of course, hostile to this doctrine, though the attack began in the Washington Presbytery of Ohio and McNemar was the one singled out for the test case.[35] The following teachings, attributed to him, were considered inconsistent with the Word of God and the constitution of the Presbyterian church:

[33] *Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone*, 31.
[33] *Ibid.*, 34, 35.
[34] *Ibid.*, 33, 34.
[35] *Ibid.*, 45.

"1. He reprobated the idea of sinners attempting to pray, or being exhorted thereto, before they were believers in Christ.

"2. He has condemned those who urge that convictions are necessary, or that prayer is proper to the sinner.

"3. He has expressly declared, at several times, that Christ has purchased salvation for all the human race, without distinction.

"4. He has expressly declared that a sinner has power to believe in Christ at any time.

"5. That a sinner has as much power to act faith, as to act unbelief; and reprobated every idea in contradiction thereto, held by persons of a contrary opinion.

"6. He has expressly said, that faith consisted in the creature's persuading himself assuredly, that Christ died for him in particular; that doubting and examining into evidences of faith were inconsistent with and contrary to the nature of faith. . . ."[36]

When the Washington Presbytery met at Cincinnati, October 6, 1802, nothing existed as a ground of prosecution, but an elder of Mr. Kemper's congregation, and a member of the Presbytery, arose, entered a verbal complaint against Mr. McNemar, as a propagator of false doctrines, and desired the Presbytery to look into the matter. The elder declared that he knew this only by hearsay, for he had never heard Mr. McNemar preach. He

[36] *Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone*, 151.

mentioned, however, a Mr. Tichner, then present, as being able to give information on the subject. The accused man opposed the measure, insisting that it was out of order, and that the only way in which charges could regularly come before the Presbytery was in writing. That body, nevertheless, proceeded with the examination.[37] The case then went to the Synod of Kentucky at Lexington. Thompson, Dunlavy, Marshal, and Stone, recognizing that McNemar's cause was their own, united with him, and the five drew up a protest against the Synod's expected action, and a declaration of independence and of withdrawal from its jurisdiction, but not communion. A committee failed to reclaim them; consequently they were suspended.[38] Soon thereafter, the revolting clergy formed the Springfield Presbytery. With regard to this organization, Stone wrote:

Stone & McNemar

1802.

"Under the name of Springfield Presbytery we went forward preaching and constituting churches; but we had not worn our name more than one year, before we saw it savored of a party spirit. With the man-made creeds we threw it overboard, and took the name *Christian*—the name given to the disciples by divine appointment first at Antioch. We published a pamphlet on this name written by Elder Rice Haggard,[39] who had lately united with us. Having divested ourselves of all party creeds, and party names, and trusting alone in God, and the word of his grace, we became a by-word and laughing stock to the sects around, all prophesying our speedy annihilation. Yet from this period I date the

[37] *Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone*, 155.
[38] *Ibid.*, 46, 47, also 168, 169.
[39] See page 63.

commencement of that reformation, which has progressed to this day. Through much tribulation and opposition we advanced, and churches and preachers were multiplied."[40]

Under the title of "The Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery," dated June 28, 1804, the original five—Robert Marshall, John Dunlavy, Richard McNemar, Barton W. Stone, and John Thompson—with a new recruit, David Purviance, issued a curious document, which began: "Imprimis. We *will* that this body die, be dissolved, and sink into union with the Body of Christ at large; for there is but one body, and one Spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling."[41] This "will" attacked the name of distinction with its *Reverend* title, the power of making laws for churches, and emphasized Bible study in the preparation for the ministry. It declared for the native right of internal self-government and the right of each church to pass on the qualifications of its candidates; it insisted that each congregation should choose its own ministers and support them by free will offerings, without a written call or subscription. It declared the Bible the "only sure guide to heaven," asked for a spirit of mutual forbearance, recommended that the people pray more and dispute less, referred weak brethren to the Rock of Ages rather than to the Springfield Presbytery, encouraged the writer of two letters lately published at Lexington in his zeal to destroy partyism, ad-

[40] *Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone*, 50.
[41] *Ibid.*, 51.

vised all sister religious bodies to read their Bibles before it was too late, and closed with the following ironical reference to the old Synod:

"We *will*, that the Synod of Kentucky examine every member, who may be *suspected* of having departed from the Confession of Faith, and suspend every such heretic immediately; in order that the oppressed may go free, and taste the sweets of gospel liberty."[42]

The opening parts of "The Witnesses' Address," which accompanied "The Last Will and Testament," gave the following explanation for their action:

"We, the above named witnesses of the Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery, knowing that there will be many conjectures respecting the causes which have occasioned the dissolution of that body, think proper to testify, that from its first existence it was knit together in love, lived in peace and concord, and died a voluntary and happy death.

"Their reasons for dissolving that body were the following: With deep concern they viewed the divisions and party spirit among professing Christians, principally owing to the adoption of human creeds and forms of government. While they were united under the name of a Presbytery, they endeavored to cultivate a spirit of love and unity with all Christians; but found it extremely difficult to suppress the idea that they themselves were a party separate from others. This difficulty increased in proportion to their success in the ministry. Jealousies were excited in the minds of other denominations; and a temptation was laid before those who were connected with the various parties, to view them in the same light."[43]

---

[42] *Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone*, 51-53.
[43] *Ibid.*, 53, 54.

The churches and ministers of this new movement increased rapidly, but troubles were ahead. Three quiet, unassuming Shakers from the East—Bates, Mitchum, and Young—arrived on the scene. Of their work, Stone wrote:

"They seemed to understand all the springs and avenues of the human heart. They delivered their testimony, and labored to confirm it by the Scriptures—promised the greatest blessing to the obedient, but certain damnation to the disobedient. They urged the people to confess their sins to them, especially the sin of matrimony, and to forsake them all immediately—husbands must forsake their wives, and wives their husbands. This was the burden of their testimony. They said they could perform miracles and related many as done among them. But we never could persuade them to try to work miracles among us."[44]

The preaching of these Shakers was very effective with some people. Many confessed their sins and forsook the married state, among them being three preachers—Matthew Houston, Richard McNemar, and John Dunlavy. Others returned to their former church homes. The Shakers, according to Stone, believed that Christ first appeared as a male, and through life was working out the way of salvation, which he could not fully accomplish until "his second appearance in a woman, Anna Lees, who was now the Christ, and had full power to save."[45] They claimed new revelations, superior to the Scriptures, or the old record, which was true, but superseded by the new. To the world, if their

[44] *Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone*, 62.
[45] *Ibid.*, 64.

enemies are to be trusted, they preached the pure Gospel as a bait to catch the unwary, but at the close of their discourse they artfully introduced their testimony.[46]

Richard McNemar, a former member of the Springfield Presbytery, indeed the immediate cause of its formation, and the author of a book on *The Kentucky Revival,* was converted to this doctrine and became an apologist for it. The charges advanced by enemies against the Shakers and considered by McNemar were:

1. They say that Christ has come the second time and that resurrection and the final judgment are begun.

2. They say that each Shaker is a Christ, and that people must throw away their Bibles and follow them.

3. They contend that we must be saved by works of the law.

4. They forbid marriage, and call that criminal for which we have the express command of God.

5. Their doctrine leads to the wrecking of homes and the mistreatment of wives.

6. They are worldly minded, cunning, sensuous, devilish deceivers.

7. They are liars.

8. They testify that they would never die, and one has already died in despair convinced of delusion.[47]

---

[46] *Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone,* 64.

[47] McNemar, Richard. *The Kentucky Revival,* 96-103.

McNemar denied the first, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth charges, and explained the Shaker position on the others. With regard to the second, he declared:

"This statement is not exactly right. They testify that there is but one Christ, whose footsteps they follow, and though they are by nature no better than any other men, yet in following Christ they may be safely followed according to the scriptures."[48]

In answering the third charge, he said:

"They believe that outward circumcision, with every other Jewish ceremony, which the apostles called works of the law, were abrogated by Christ, nor have they attempted to revive any of them. But Christ, in disannulling these *dead works,* made no provision for *bad works.* The only alternative he left for any one was to follow him in the regeneration, or continue under the *law* and under its curse. . . ."[49]

In commenting on the early history of the Stone movement, J. F. Burnett said:

"It is a remarkable item in the history of our movement that the five who first withdrew from the Presbyterian Church in the west, were lost to the church they helped to start, Marshall and Thompson returned to the Presbyterians, McNemar and Dunlevy united with the Shakers, and Stone was lost to us in his affiliation with the Disciples, with which people he never united except in cooperation."[50]

---

[48] McNemar, Richard. *The Kentucky Revival,* 97.

[49] *Ibid.,* 99.

[50] *The Origin and Principles of the Christians,* 43. The last statement is denied by Disciples.

The first two currents—the O'Kelly schism from the Methodists in Virginia and North Carolina and the Jones division from the Baptists in Vermont and New Hampshire—united with the Stone movement in Kentucky, thereby forming the Christian Connection.[51] This union was a natural one, for the objects of the leaders were practically the same:

1. All desired to escape the thraldom of human creeds.
2. All made the Bible the only guide.
3. All desired the right of private judgment.
4. All wanted to pattern after the simplicity of primitive Christianity.

These objects, as will be seen later, were common also to the Disciples of Christ, who did not have a separate existence until a quarter of a century after the three preliminary movements had begun to appear.

[51] Carroll, H. K. *The Religious Forces of the United States*, 91.

III

THREE EARLY LEADERS

AMONG the numerous leaders of the Disciples of Christ four men stand out as the "big four": Barton Warren Stone, Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, and Walter Scott.[1] The experiences of the first have already been discussed in part, but the early life and influences affecting the Campbells and the work of Scott will be considered in this chapter.

Ireland 1763-1854 America

Thomas Campbell was born in County Down, Ireland, February 1, 1763. His father, Archibald, had been a Romanist in early life, and had served in the British army under General Wolfe. After the capture of Quebec, the young soldier returned to his native country, abjured Catholicism, and became a strict member of the Church of England, to which he adhered until his death at eighty-eight. His four daughters died in infancy, but he gave his four sons—Thomas, James, Archibald, and Enos—an excellent education at a military regimental school not far away. Thomas seems to have been the favorite among these children, but even he did

[1] Haley, J. J. *Makers and Molders of the Reformation Movement*, 59.

not always escape the effects of his father's hasty temper. On one occasion, when he was conducting worship, he prayed unusually long. The kneeling posture, because of rheumatism, became painful to his father, and no sooner was he on his feet than he began, greatly to the surprise and scandal of all present, to beat the late prayer leader with his cane for keeping them so long upon their knees.[2]

In early youth, Thomas became the subject of deep religious impressions, and acquired a most sincere and earnest love for the Scriptures. On account of the cold formality of the Episcopal ritual and the apparent lack of vital piety in that church, he turned to the more rigid and devotional Covenanters and Seceders. With increasing age came growing concern for his salvation. By earnest and diligent prayer, he long sought, seemingly in vain, tokens of acceptance and forgiveness, but one day, when walking alone in the fields, the sense of acceptance dawned. As Richardson, his biographer, expressed it:

> "His doubts, anxieties and fears were at once dissipated, as if by enchantment. He was enabled to see and to trust in the merits of a crucified Christ, and to enjoy a divine sense of reconciliation, that filled him with rapture and seemed to determine his destiny forever. From this moment he recognized himself as consecrated to God, and thought only how he might best appropriate his time and his abilities to his service."[3]

[2] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell.* I., 21, 22.
[3] *Ibid.*, I., 23.

Soon after this experience, the young convert evinced a desire to devote himself to the Secession ministry, but his father had no sympathy for his son's religion. He wanted him, following his example, "to serve God according to act of Parliament." Moreover, he had extreme views on parental authority as well as other matters. Thomas, accordingly, postponed a definite decision. In the meantime, however, he wished to be engaged in helpful work, and having heard of the unenlightened conditions in certain portions of southern Ireland, he went down to Connaught and established an English academy in one of the most benighted sections. Here he soon obtained a large number of pupils, and was doing a successful work, when his father's peremptory summons brought him home. Upon his return to the North, he obtained a good school at Sheepbridge near Newry, through the influence of a Seceder named John Kinley.[4] This friend had such a high opinion of his abilities that he urged him to enter the ministry, and offered the necessary means to pay his expenses. Since his father finally consented, the young teacher proceeded to Glasgow, where he became a student of the University.

There he took the three year course for students of divinity, and also attended the medical lectures in order that he could, if called upon, render necessary aid to his poorer parishioners who might not be able to secure the services of a regular medical

[4] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 24, 25.

attendant. After completing the literary course, he entered the theological school established by the Anti-Burghers. Since the number preparing for the ministry was not large, ordinarily from twenty to thirty, this school was in charge of a single professor, who was appointed by the Synod. At that time Archibald Bruce was Doctor of Divinity, and the school was at Whitburn, where Mr. Bruce served as minister, it being the custom to transfer the Divinity Hall to the place where the professor appointed was living. Before admission, the candidates were examined in Latin and Greek by the Presbytery within whose limits they resided. An examination was also given on the branches of philosophy which they had studied at the University as well as on personal religion. The usual course of attendance was five annual sessions of eight weeks each, with some exceptions in the case of missions and a scarcity of ministers. After completing the prescribed course and undergoing the usual examination and trials for license before the Presbytery in Ireland, Thomas Campbell became a probationer. Probationers, under the supervision of the Synod, were required to preach the Gospel in such congregations as were destitute of a regular ministry. While studying and attending to these duties, Campbell became acquainted with the descendants of the Huguenots, who had settled on the borders of Lough Neagh, and later married one of them, Miss Jane Corneigle.[5]

[5] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 25-27.

About 1798, the young minister accepted a call from a church at Ahorey, four miles from the city of Armagh, and accordingly moved to a farm near Rich Hill about ten miles from the flourishing town of Newry in one of the most beautiful and richest regions of Ireland, where he became noted as a popular, faithful, and diligent pastor—"hospitable, sober, just, holy, temperate." In addition to his frequent and ordinary visits, he, accompanied by one or two elders, made a parochial tour twice a year in order to inquire into the state of religion in every family, catechise the children, examine the older members on their Bible reading, pray with them, and give necessary admonitions and exhortations. No feature in his character was more strongly marked than reverence for the Bible. Thus, when he found the children of the congregation confounding, in their answers, the language of the catechism with that of the Scripture, he began to leave out the former, fearing that the children would consider it of equal authority with the Bible.[6]

Thomas Campbell, thus busied with his pastoral duties and opposed to distractions from principles, kept entirely aloof from politics. This was very difficult, for his ministry in Ireland extended through the years of disturbances which came to a head in the rebellion of 1798 and the attempt of

[6] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 38-40. At Rich Hill he also conducted a good academy, which brought him about £200 a year (Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 48).

Emmet and others in 1803.[7] The society of Orangemen was formed in 1795, in Armagh, apparently with the intention of driving the entire Catholic peasantry from the country. Other parties of contending rioters as the Catholic "Defenders" and the Protestant "Peep-o'-day Boys" disturbed various parts of Ulster. They went about at night searching for arms and plundering people of their property.[8] While these troubles were going on, the "United Irishmen" were formed, chiefly through the agency of Theobald Wolfe Tone, a Protestant lawyer of Dublin. The professed object of the association was to unite people of all creeds and classes in an agitation for parliamentary reform and Catholic emancipation, but the leaders soon looked towards a separate and independent Irish republic.[9] The Catholics united with this organization in order to obtain protection from the Orangemen and a redress of grievances, while the Presbyterians joined because they were earnestly desirous of bringing about a reform in Parliament and of securing equal representation and taxation.

Since the majority of the Presbyterians belonged to this movement, Campbell's utter refusal to have anything to do with it brought him into temporary disrepute. On one occasion, he was requested to deliver a sermon on the lawfulness of oaths and of secret societies, but his candid and earnest con-

[7] Lawless, E. *Ireland*, 354-366.
[8] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 41.
[9] Hunt, W. *History of England*, 1760-1801, 367, 368.

demnation of them excited and exasperated such a large portion of his audience that a prominent member of the church, fearing lest he should be insulted, took him by the arm and conducted him safely through the angry congregation.[10] The tide of feeling soon shifted, however, for the Presbyterians enlisted as United Irishmen began to fear from the greater number of the Catholics; accordingly, when the latter in Wicklow and Wexford, on the eastern coast, expecting aid from France, hurried into shocking barbarities in retaliation for injuries, the United Irishmen of Ulster, estimated at 150,000, with few exceptions, remained quiet.

One day, during this troubled period, Campbell was preaching to a congregation, when a troop of Welsh horse, noted for their cruelty to rebels, surrounded the house. The captain, thinking that he had surprised a meeting of rebels, dismounted and in a threatening manner marched into the church. Just at the crucial moment, when he was striding up the aisle, casting fierce glances first on one side and then on the other, an old elder sitting near Mr. Campbell called out, "Pray, sir!" In a firm, deep voice, the minister began in the language of the forty-sixth Psalm: "Thou, O God, art our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. There-

[10] Campbell, nevertheless, maintained the confidence of the community. The governor, Lord Gosford, urged him to become the tutor of his family, offering him a large salary and a fine residence on his estate. He declined this offer for fear that his children would be snared and fascinated by the fashions and customs of the nobility (Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 43).

fore will not we fear though the earth be removed and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea.'' At the first verse the captain stopped and bent his head. He listened to the close, then bowed, retired, mounted his horse and dashed away with all his men.[11]

Because of their influence upon Thomas Campbell and his son, it will be necessary to discuss briefly religious conditions in northern Ireland. After the final establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland, 1690-1707,[12] missionary efforts led to the founding of congregations in the Ulster region. The National Church, however, was unpopular, and in 1712 it attempted to enforce the existing law of patronage so as to deprive congregations of the right of choosing their ministers. This was against the decision of the early Reformers and the provision of the first Book of Discipline that ''no minister should be intruded upon any particular kirk without their consent.'' Since remonstrances and arguments proved unavailing, four ministers, under the influence of Alexander Erskine, formally seceded in 1733, and formed the Associate Presbytery, which became the nucleus of a new party called Seceders. A little later another separation from the National Church for similar reasons led to the formation of the Presbytery of Relief under the leadership of a man named Thomas Boston.

[11] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 42-44.

[12] Lang, A. *A History of Scotland from the Roman Occupation*, IV., 80.

This party differed little from the Seceders except in holding more liberal views in regard to communion.[13]

The Secession Church continued in a prosperous condition until 1747, when it divided upon the question whether certain oaths required by the burgesses of towns, binding them to support "the religion presently professed within the realm" did not sanction the same abuses in the National Church against which they had protested. Those who considered the oath unlawful were called Anti-Burghers; the others, Burghers. The division soon spread through the churches in Scotland and Ireland, and was kept up with much bitterness for some time. All Presbyterians, however, were one in their hatred for prelacy. At the Burgher Synod in October, 1750, a Seceder stonemason, who persisted in working on an Episcopal Chapel, was called to task. His sin was considered at least equal to that of building the "high places" mentioned in the Old Testament, and he was declared highly censurable and not deserving of admission to the seals of the Covenant until he professed sorrow for his sin and the resulting scandal.[14]

In 1795, a question arose among the Burghers in regard to the power of civil magistrates in religious matters, as declared in the twenty-third chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and also as to the perpetual obligation of the

[13] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 51-54.
[14] *Ibid.*, I., 55.

"Solemn League and Covenant." This caused a division into the "Original" or "Old Light Burghers," and the "New Light Burghers." The same controversy occurred among the Anti-Burghers with similar results. Consequently, there were no less than four different bodies of Seceders, each with its own "testimony," but each also accepting the Westminster Confession. Moreover, minor defections of temporary importance were not lacking.[15] These schisms oppressed Thomas Campbell, and he made frequent attempts at reunion. A committee of consultation met at Rich Hill, October, 1804. Propositions of union prepared by Campbell were presented to the Synod at Belfast and favorably received. In March, 1805, a joint meeting was held at Lurgan, and the desire for union seemed to be well-nigh unanimous. The ground advanced was that the Burgher oath was never required in Ireland; hence there were no conditions there justifying division.[16]

The General Associate Synod of Scotland, however, hearing of these attempts at union, took occasion to show its disapproval in advance of any application. The next year, the Provincial Synod of Ireland requested of the Scottish Synod permission to transact its own business without being in immediate subordination to it. Thomas Campbell carried the request to the Synod at Glasgow, but that body

[15] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 55, 56.
[16] *Ibid.*, I., 56, 57.

refused.[17] The movement for union continued to gather weight, nevertheless, and, in 1820, after some of the town councils had abolished the religious clause of the Burgher oath, union was actually consummated in the same Bristo-street Church in Edinburgh where the division had occurred seventy-three years before.[18]

The varied duties of preaching and teaching at Rich Hill, coupled with efforts to promote Christian union, proved more than Thomas Campbell could stand. He grew pale, dyspeptic, and weak. His physician informed him that his life would be the forfeit if he persisted in his unremitting toil, and that absolute change and a protracted sea voyage were necessary for his recovery. Consequently, on April 1, 1807, he bade his congregation farewell, and on April 8, 1807, set sail for America.[19] Of his work here—his connection with the Presbyterians, his trial by them for heresy, the famous *Declaration and Address*, his relations with the Baptists, his educational labors, his opposition to Mormonism, his evangelistic work, and other labors—more will be told from time to time. His life was as full and useful as it had been in Europe.

---

[17] A man who heard the debates, made the following statement to Alexander Campbell, about four years later, when the latter was a student at the University: "I listened to your father in our General Assembly in this city, pleading for a union between Burghers and Anti-Burghers. But, sir, while in my opinion he outargued them, they outvoted him" (Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 58).

[18] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 58.

[19] *Ibid.*, I., 79-81.

He passed to his reward January 4, 1854.

Thomas Campbell gave shape and form to the movement which is here discussed, but the leadership of that movement and its defence early fell to his son, Alexander, who was born in County Antrim, Ireland, near Ballymena, in the parish of Broughshane, September 12, 1788.[21] The youth of the latter differed little from that of other boys raised in pious families. He attended an elementary school in Market Hill for awhile, and then spent two or three years in school at Newry, where his uncles, Archibald and Enos, had opened an academy. When he returned home, his father tried to superintend his education. The boy, however, was so fond of youthful sports that it was difficult to fix his mind on studies. Nevertheless, about his ninth year, French was added to his other languages. In this study, apparently, he made little progress, at least, if the following anecdote is accepted as a criterion. One warm day he went out under the shade of a tree to study *The Adventures of Telemachus,* and fell asleep. A cow, which was grazing near by, came up, seized the book, and before the youthful student could fully awaken, actually devoured it. Upon reporting the loss to his father he received a thrashing for his carelessness, and the reprimand that "the cow had more French in her stomach than he had in his head."[22]

[20] The *Millennial Harbinger Abridged,* II., 414.
[21] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 19.
[22] *Ibid.,* I., 31.

The father soon wisely concluded to put his son to work on the farm along with the laborers. The boy liked his new tasks, and worked hard for several years until he became a stalwart young fellow. He then began to manifest a love for reading, and less inclination for outdoor exercise. His memory became remarkably retentive. On one occasion he is said to have committed sixty lines of blank verse in fifty-two minutes so that he could repeat them without missing a word. From now on, he began to memorize the finer passages of English literature, and his mind became literally stored with the best passages of the British poets. He also read with interest the standard English writings on morals, philosophy, and religion. Locke's *Letters on Toleration* seem to have fixed his ideas of civil and religious liberty. Under the guidance of his father, he studied carefully Locke's *Essay on the Human Understanding,* Latin, and Greek. In spite of this work, however, he did not forget games. Among the boys he was noted for the size of his snowballs and the force with which they were thrown. He was an excellent swimmer, and fond of fishing as well as of capturing birds with nets and of hunting. He was a favorite among the farmers also, because of his expertness in sowing grain.[23]

While carefully watching over the literary education of his son, and giving him time for sports, Thomas Campbell did not neglect his religious

[23] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 32-35.

training. The Synod to which he belonged prescribed that the minister

"should worship God in his family by singing, reading and prayer, morning and evening; that he should catechise and instruct them at least once a week in religion; endeavoring to cause every member to pray in secret morning and evening; and that he should remember the Lord's day to keep it holy, and should himself maintain a conversation becoming the gospel."[24]

Thomas Campbell, ably assisted by his wife, fulfilled all these duties. He required every member of the family each day to memorize some portion of the Bible to be recited at evening worship. All passages learned during the week were repeated again on the Lord's Day.[25] Concerning his mother's share in this early education, Alexander Campbell wrote, long after her death:

"She made a nearer approximation to the acknowledged beau ideal of a Christian mother than any one of her sex with whom I have had the pleasure of forming a special acquaintance. I can but gratefully add, that to my mother, as well as to my father, I am indebted for having memorized in early life almost all the writings of King Solomon—his Proverbs, his Ecclesiastes—and many of the Psalms of his father David. They have not only been written on the tablet of my memory, but incorporated with my modes of thinking and speaking."[26]

Perhaps at this time, it will be advisable to consider some of the positive religious influences by

[24] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 35.
[25] *Ibid.*, I., 36.
[26] *Ibid.*, I., 37.

which the Campbells were surrounded. The Independents, who had a congregation at Rich Hill under the charge of a Mr. Gibson, exercised a marked influence upon the views of both. Often, after returning from the Lord's Day services at the country church of Ahorey, Thomas Campbell, who was on intimate terms with Mr. Gibson, attended the night meetings of the Independents. The Seceders allowed, but did not encourage this, under the privilege of "occasional hearing," provided there was no Seceder meeting within reach at the same hour. The Independents were always glad to see Mr. Campbell, but they often compared him laughingly to Nicodemus, "who came to Jesus by night."[27] Since they were more liberal than others in granting the use of their meeting houses, many ministers of various views preached there, as Rowland Hill, James Alexander Haldane, Alexander Carson, an Independent recruit from the Presbyterians, and John Walker. The latter deeply impressed Alexander Campbell. Walker had been a fellow and teacher in Trinity College and minister at Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, but, in 1804, he resigned and formed a separate society. He taught that there should be no stated minister, but that all members should exercise their gifts indiscriminately. He considered baptism superfluous, except to those who never before professed Christianity. He was Calvinistic in doctrine, but insisted that

[27] *John* 3: 2.

true worship could be rendered only by those who received and obeyed the same truths in common.[28]

John Glass, an able and eloquent minister of the Church of Scotland, had adopted Independent views about 1728, and had founded churches in most of the large towns of Scotland, where his followers were called Glassites. The acknowledged champion of the Scotch Independents, however, was the son-in-law of Glass, Robert Sandeman. Some of his doctrines were: faith is merely a simple assent to the testimony concerning Christ, there is no difference between believing any common testimony and believing the apostolic testimony, the weekly observance of the Lord's Supper, love feasts, weekly contributions for the poor, mutual exhortation of members, plurality of elders in a church, and conditional community of goods. He approved of theatres and public and private diversions, when not connected with circumstances really sinful. Although the Independents at Rich Hill were in connection with those of Scotland, they were Haldanean in sentiment and did not adopt all the views of either Glass or Sandeman. They attended weekly to the Lord's Supper and contributions, but they were opposed to attendance at theatres or similar places of public amusements, and to the doctrine of community of goods and footwashing. They were, moreover, free, in part at least, from the dogmatic

[28] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 59-62.

and bitter spirit of controversy so characteristic of Sandeman and his followers.[29]

The Campbells, however, came in contact with a more evangelical style of preaching. True, the intense religious interest aroused in Great Britain and Ireland by Wesley, Whitefield, and their helpers had given way to some indifference and worldly conformity by the close of the century. Moreover, the spread of infidel principles from France, political commotions and a variety of circumstances connected with the American and French wars seemed to be partly responsible for a series of changes lamented by the pious everywhere. These very things, nevertheless, had led to a united effort to arouse the people to greater religious activity by the formerly successful open air preaching and itinerancy. The Haldanes of Scotland were among those conspicuously engaged in this work. A large missionary organization, called the Evangelical Society, was formed. It consisted, in part, of the members of the Episcopal Church in England. Since Thomas Campbell sympathized warmly with the proposed work, he became a member of the Society and took great pleasure in furthering its operations. Liberal and earnest preachers toured the country. They were freed, as missionaries in heathen lands, in part at least, from sectarian necessities and were left "alone with the Word of God and the souls of men."[30]

[29] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 70, 71.
[30] *Ibid.*, I., 72-75.

A little while after his father's departure to America, Alexander Campbell[31] came into more direct contact with the molding influences at Glasgow University, which he attended less than a year. He entered the classes of Professor Young, both public and private, in Greek; of Professor Jardine, public and private, in Logic and Belles Lettres; and Dr. Ure's class in Experimental Philosophy. In addition to these regular classes, he again took up the study of French and devoted much time to English reading and composition. This schedule kept him very busy. He went to bed at ten o'clock and got up at four. At six he attended his French class, from seven to eight a class in the Greek Testament, and from eight to ten his Latin classes. He then returned home to bathe and breakfast. In the afternoon he recited in a more advanced Greek class and in Logic. He also attended several lectures each week delivered by Dr. Ure and accompanied with experiments in natural science.[32]

While he was in school at Glasgow, Alexander Campbell's sympathies were disengaged entirely from the Seceder denomination and every form of Presbyterianism. This result was brought about chiefly by his intimacy with Greville Ewing, a

[31] He had taken charge of his father's academy at Rich Hill, but on October 1, 1808, in response to his father's request, he and the rest of the family set sail for America. On October 7 their vessel was shipwrecked on the Isle of Islay, one of the Hebrides, and this accident gave Alexander a chance to attend the University at Glasgow, which he entered November 8, 1808 (*Millennial Harbinger*, II., 405).

[32] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 129-131.

skilled Biblical critic, an excellent expositor of the Word, and a friend and follower of the Haldanes —Robert and James Alexander. The elder, Robert, had sold his big estate, and influenced by the example of Carey, had intended to go to India. The East India Company, however, refused him permission to set up a mission among the Hindoos. The younger brother had also sold his property, and studied his Bible. He delivered his first sermon, May 6, 1797, and on January 11, 1798, established at Edinburgh a society for propagating the Gospel. The necessary funds were largely supplied by Robert Haldane, who soon after this took up a project which had originated with John Campbell, a devout and successful ironmonger of Edinburgh—namely, securing from Africa thirty or thirty-five children, educating them in Great Britain, and sending them back home as missionaries. At the last minute, however, after the children were actually in London, the directors of the Sierra Leone Company began to hesitate about putting them under Mr. Haldane's care because of the supposed liberality of his religious views. Since the latter refused alteration in the early agreement, the children were educated by other means and sent back home.

The two Haldanes, Mr. Ewing, John Campbell, and others now determined to form a congregational church. Ewing drew up the plan for its government, and J. A. Haldane was invited to become its pastor. The church was constituted in January, 1799, and about three hundred and ten

Beginning of Congregational Church 1799

persons at once united with it. The avowed object of this new organization was to enjoy the benefit of Christian fellowship on a Scriptural basis, observe the ordinances, and avoid that narrow spirit which would exclude from the pulpit or occasional communion any faithful preacher or sincere lover of Christ. The younger Haldane successfully discharged his duties as pastor for fifty-two years or until his death, February 8, 1851, at the age of eighty-three. Soon after the formation of this church, Robert Haldane went to Glasgow, and purchased for £3,000 a large building which had been used as a circus. Greville Ewing was installed as minister. Before Alexander Campbell visited Glasgow, the elder Haldane had already spent more than £60,000 for the spread of the Gospel at home. The influences started by his money and work, and by the incessant, liberal, and effective labors of his brother, are said to have produced a marked impression in Great Britain and in Protestant Europe.[33]

Since Alexander Campbell came in direct contact with many of these Haldanean leaders, it will be worth while to consider their views. The Haldanes regarded the writings of Glass and Sandeman as exhibiting, in places, noble views of the freeness of the Gospel and the simplicity of faith, but they disliked their intolerant spirit. Like Sandeman and Glass, they regarded faith as resting on the evidence furnished by the Holy Spirit in the Scrip-

[33] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 147-175.

tures, but as embracing the heart also. Both Haldanes, in explaining faith, said that "trust or confidence in Christ seemed substantially to express the meaning of the term."[84] This view Alexander Campbell later adopted, and continued to defend throughout his life. The Haldanes did not wish to teach new beliefs; they merely wanted to awaken the people to greater religious zeal, but the opposition of the clergy finally led to the formation of a new church. Even though the two brothers did not favor the views of Glass and Sandeman, the influence of the latter was felt, nevertheless, because Greville Ewing leaned toward some of his doctrines. Thus, while the Scottish National Church observed the Lord's Supper only twice a year, Ewing introduced at Glasgow, the practice of celebrating it every Sunday. This was soon adopted by the Edinburgh Church and the rest of the new churches, and later by the Campbells.

These differences of opinion foreshadowed a rupture. About 1805, William Ballantine published his *Treatise on the Elder's Office,* which hastened the crisis. Ballantine insisted upon a plurality of elders in every church, and upon the importance of mutual exhortation on the Lord's Day. The Haldanes adopted these views, and great disaffection was thereby caused. During the spring previous to Alexander Campbell's visit to Glasgow, J. A. Haldane had told his congregation that he could

[84] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 177.

no longer baptize children. In April, 1808, he was immersed, and the division, long imminent, at once took place. Many members went back to the Established Church, some of Aikman's Church in College Street, and a large number decided to form a separate church and, as a result, rented a room in which to meet. The rest, about two hundred, remained with Haldane. Although baptism was made a matter of forbearance, Robert Haldane and many others were immersed. Immersion at that time, however, did not attract Alexander Campbell in the least. The Haldanes did not insist upon it as a term of communion. Moreover, Ewing, with whom he had spent much time, was opposed to it, and had published treatises against it. These were criticized and confuted by Alexander Carson, a former classmate of Ewing's; hence the subject was not likely to come up among the latter's guests.[85]

Greville Ewing, and Dr. Wardlaw, the alternate preacher in Ewing's congregation, were both excellent lecturers. The Seceder minister, a Mr. Montre, was a prosy speaker. Campbell did not like his delivery; hence he availed himself of every chance possible under the privilege of "occasional hearing." This opportunity to hear preachers of different denominations fostered his independence of mind, but the facts relating to the Haldanes so often narrated to him by Ewing and others furnished the chief cause for his changed religious

[85] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 178-187.

views. The persistent opposition of the clergy to overtures for reformation, their unscrupulous methods in opposition, and their arbitrary exercise of power made him more favorable to Congregationalism, and the consequent freedom from the control of domineering Synods and General Assemblies. Nevertheless, he did not want to give up too rashly the cherished religious views of his youth and the Seceder Church to which all his people belonged, and in which he thought it his duty to be a regular communicant; hence he decided to ask the elders for the metallic token which was necessary to communion. Since his membership was in Ireland and he had no letter, they required him to be examined before he was given the token. He waited until the last table, hoping to overcome his scruples, but he failed and declined to partake with the rest.[86] Of this incident, his biographer, Richardson, wrote:

Campbell's change from Presbyterian

"It was at this moment that the struggle in his mind was completed, and the ring of the token, falling upon the plate, announced the instant at which he renounced Presbyterianism forever—the leaden voucher becoming thus a token not of communion but of separation. This change, however, was as yet confined to his own heart. He was yet young, and thought it unbecoming to make known publicly his objections, and as he had fully complied with all the rules of the church, he thought it proper to receive at his departure the usual certificate of good standing."[87]

[86] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 187-190.
[87] *Ibid.*, I., 190.

After the term closed at Glasgow in May, Campbell went to Helensburg as a tutor in several families, and spent five weeks there to the great satisfaction of all. He then heard of a chance to embark for America, and had to give up his work and return to Glasgow in order to make preparations to move all the family. Various delays occurred; consequently his ship did not weigh anchor until August 3, 1809.[88] It cast anchor in New York harbor September 29.[89] Concerning Campbell's relations with the Presbyterians, the Baptists and other religious organizations as well as his debates, editorial, educational, and missionary work more will be related in the following chapters.

Brief mention must be made of one other important leader at this time—Walter Scott—a young Scotch Presbyterian, of good family and education, who reached New York in 1819. After forming some acquaintances in that city, he set off for Pittsburg with a young companion of about his own age. Because of their limited finances, they found it necessary to travel on foot. At Pittsburg Scott met a fellow countryman, with whom he talked much on religious matters. These talks led to his abandonment of infant baptism, and his immersion. About this time he also met a Mr. Richardson who formed quite a liking for him and employed him as

[88] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 190-194.
[89] *Ibid.*, I., 205.

a tutor for his son Robert.[40] Scott, meanwhile, studied his Bible, pondered over it, and longed to preach it; hence his school duties became irksome to him, and he determined to go to New York, where he might be useful to the congregation, which held the sentiments of the Haldanes and the Scotch Baptists. The patrons of the school, Mr. Richardson in particular, were grieved to lose such a valuable and popular teacher; consequently they made efforts to bring him back by making up a good purse and urging him to return and become a private tutor for their families. An answer to their letter soon came, intimating Scott's disappointment in New York. About two weeks later the young teacher himself appeared; he was dusty and travel worn, having for a second time walked the entire distance, this time for variety by way of Washington City. Mr. Richardson gave him good quarters in his house, and an apartment where he could daily assemble his pupils, who were limited to fifteen in number. Scott, although requiring perfect order and accurate recitations, was kind to his pupils and popular with them.[41]

The long desired opportunity to engage in ministerial work came to him through the accidental death by drowning of his esteemed friend and father in the Gospel, Mr. Forrester. Scott at once

[40] This son, who afterward married a daughter of Alexander Campbell and wrote the *Memoirs* so frequently quoted, was one of the most gifted writers of the new movement.

[41] Richardson, Robert. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 502-506.

took up the work of comforting and assisting the widow and her orphans, as well as of caring for the church which Forrester had formed. Naturally he turned to the study of the Bible with more zeal than ever, and in the exercise of his great analytical powers, he soon discovered that *Matthew, Mark, Luke,* and *John* were written to prove that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." He had thus by a different process reached the same view which Alexander Campbell had attained in eliminating from the Christian faith everything that seemed foreign to its nature.[42] These leaders met at Pittsburg soon after Scott's arrival there.

A comparison of the two may be profitable. Both men came from the British Isles; both received part of their education in Scotland; both descended from Presbyterian stock; both were men of wonderful intellectual ability and reasoning powers; both possessed deep religious natures and a keen insight for and love of the truth. In physical appearance and intellectual characteristics, however, they were decidedly different. Campbell was tall, well-built and athletic; his features were irregular, even his nose being turned slightly to the right, his eyes, though piercing, were light, and his hair also was comparatively light. Scott was of medium height, and slender; his features were regular, his nose straight, his lips full, his eyes dark and lustrous, his hair black. The aspect of the one

[42] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 507-510.

was lively and cheerful; of the other, meditative, sometimes sad. Campbell was fearless, firm, self-reliant; Scott was timid, yielding, diffident. The former was calm, persevering, prudent; the latter was excitable, variable, impetuous. In the one, the understanding predominated; in the other, the feelings. Campbell liked to trace analogies and generalize; Scott preferred to make comparisons and analyze. One was a successful business man, farmer, and editor, a born organizer and executive; the other lacked the highest business organizing ability and was somewhat deficient in executive power, yet he could move others to action in a way his older companion never attained. Campbell never disappointed his hearers; nevertheless, he seldom surprised them; Scott sometimes disappointed his auditors, but he often astonished them. The former was pre-eminently a teacher; the latter was an evangelist, a magnetic orator, who frequently reached heights never attained by Campbell. The older man convinced the understanding; the younger changed the heart. The former was a deeper, more logical thinker and possessed of a tougher intellectual fiber; the latter, though at times somewhat superficial, was quicker and more brilliant, perhaps more versatile. The two were complementary; each supplied what the other lacked. Together they made a wonderful team for Gospel work; together they guided the "Reformation" movement to success. Deprived of the ser-

vices of either that movement might have failed. Its development would certainly have been different.[43]

Walter Scott's opinions were always respected by Alexander Campbell. Before taking up the publication of the *Christian Baptist,* Campbell consulted him about the name of the proposed paper,[44] and Scott contributed many articles to it, among them essays on "Teaching Christianity," which developed his favorite theme of the Messiahship of Jesus.[45] The young Scotchman was also a favorite with other ministers. In Pittsburg, after the meeting of the Red Stone Association in 1823, intimacy developed between him and Sidney Rigdon and their respective congregations. This led, the next year, to a union between the two churches.[46] In 1825, Rigdon returned to Ohio, and the church at Pittsburg remained under the care of Scott, who still continued his school teaching.[47] In 1826, he moved to Steubenville, Ohio, where he opened an academy.[48] The next year he was elected evangelist of the Mahoning Association by a unanimous vote.[49] The committee report nominating him read as follows:

Mahoning Asso.

[43] The best comparison of these two leaders is found in Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 510-512. Richardson had been one of Scott's pupils, and he was Campbell's son-in-law; hence he wrote with authority and insight.

[44] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 49.

[45] The *Christian Baptist,* 1823-1830.

[46] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 99.

[47] *Ibid.,* II., 128.

[48] The *Millennial Harbinger,* II., 407.

[49] *Ibid.,* 408.

"1. That Brother Walter Scott is a suitable person for the task, and that he is willing, provided the Association concur in his appointment, to devote his whole energies to the work.

"2. That voluntary and liberal contributions be recommended to the churches to raise a fund for his support.

"3. That, at the discretion of Brother Scott, as far as respects time and place, four quarterly meetings be held in the bounds of this Association this year for public worship and edification, and that at these meetings such contributions as have been made in the churches in these vicinities be handed over to Brother Scott, and an account kept of the same, to be produced at the next Association. Also, that at any time and at any church where Brother Scott may be laboring, any contributions made to him shall be accounted for in the next Association." [50]

Mahoning Assoc.

This Association, which met at New Lisbon, Ohio, August 23, 1827, was very important for the following reasons:

1. It brought among Disciples of Christ, ministers of the "Christian" fraternity (C. J. Merrill, John Secrest, and Joseph Gaston), and made them fully equal in action.

2. It appointed an evangelist "in the pure New Testament idea of that official minister by the concurrent action of the ministry of a given district of country. In this it took upon itself the new duty of *establishing* and *regulating an evangelical agency or ministry.*" [51]

---

[50] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 174, 175.

[51] Hayden, A. S. *Early History of Disciples of Christ in Western Reserve*, 59, 60.

3. It assumed this power of appointing an evangelist, in itself a rather revolutionary procedure.

4. The evangelist was to be supported by all.

5. The Association imposed upon its representative no doctrinal restrictions or limitations, as creeds, confessions of faith, and articles of belief. His duty was to "preach the Word."[52]

In January, 1828, soon after his appointment as evangelist, Scott visited Alexander Campbell, and together they studied the Bible.[53] Two months later he began his work at Lisbon, where he developed the Gospel plan of salvation, and successfully preached baptism for the remission of sin, William Amend of Lisbon being the first person to be baptized for that express purpose by the Mahoning evangelist.[54] Scott was a gifted, but an eccentric preacher. On one occasion he met a new audience, which seemed indifferent. He asked all who were on the Lord's side to rise. No one moved. He then requested all who were for the devil to stand. No one stood. After looking at the audience for a moment, he said: "I never saw such a crowd before. If you had stood up either for God or the devil, I would know what to do, but as it is, I am in the dark. You may go home, and I will study the case till to-morrow evening, and then I'll try to

[52] Hayden, A. S. *Early History of Disciples of Christ in Western Reserve*, 60, 61.

[53] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 408.

[54] *Ibid.*, 408. This sermon and the Gospel steps in salvation will be considered in a later chapter.

treat it.''[55] The people were astonished, but the appointed hour found a crowded house, and proved the beginning of a successful revival meeting.[56] Scott's ability as speaker may be illustrated by the following incident. In 1830, while preaching on his favorite theme of the Messiahship before a large crowd in a grove near Wheeling, Virginia, he had as one of his audience a noted auditor, usually very calm and self composed—Alexander Campbell. Since Scott was at his best, Campbell became enthused: his eyes flashed, his face glowed, and at last he shouted, ''Glory to God in the highest.''[57]

In spite of his oratorical and evangelistic gifts, however, Scott was often deficient in tact and guilty of repartee not conducive to harmony. Thus, at Salem, after he had baptized forty people in ten days as converts to Christ, without reference to creed, he raised opposition by asking, ''Who will now say there is a Baptist church in Salem?''[58] On another occasion, a man who was unfriendly to Scott's preaching and on notoriously bad terms with all his neighbors declared to the evangelist, ''I want to see more heart religion in it;'' the reply was, ''Aye, and I want to see a man not keep all his religion in his heart, but let some of it come out so his neighbors can see it.''[59] Again, to a Method-

[55] Davis, M. M. *The Restoration Movement of the Nineteenth Century*, 164, 165.
[56] *Ibid.*, 165.
[57] Davis, M. M. *How the Disciples Began and Grew*, 207.
[58] Hayden, A. S. *Disciples in Western Reserve*, 117.
[59] *Ibid.*, 333.

ist lady who had said, "You have to sing our songs," Scott replied, "We ought to; we get your converts."[60] The evangelist's talents, nevertheless, multiplied as they were by efficient helpers, brought marked success. Thus, he reported in 1829:

"The Gospel, since last year, has been preached with great success in Palmyra, Deerfield, Randolph, Shalersville, Nelson, Hiram, etc., etc., by Bros. Finch, Hubbard, Ferguson, Bosworth, Hayden, and others. Several new churches have been formed; and so far as I am enabled to judge, the congregations are in a very flourishing condition. . . ."[61]

Scott combined other labors with his preaching. In the autumn of 1836, Bacon College was founded at Georgetown, and Scott served as president for a while.[62] In 1844, he was located at Pittsburg again, where he preached for the church, and for the one at Allegheny City. Moreover, he edited the *Protestant Unionist,* which did good service to Protestantism as a whole and to the Disciples of Christ in particular.[63] In addition, Scott helped further the growth of the organization idea which became prominent in the forties. In Ohio, Kentucky, Missouri, Indiana, and Iowa, as well as in Virginia and a few other states, the feeling developed that in order to do the work well, a definite and earnest co-operation was necessary.[64]

[60] Hayden, A. S. *Disciples in Western Reserve,* 173.
[61] *Ibid.,* 173.
[62] Moore, W. T. *A Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ,* 358.
[63] Davis, M. M. *The Restoration Movement of the Nineteenth Century,* 165.
[64] Moore, W. T. *A Comprehensive History,* 412.

The closing years of Scott's life were spent at Mayslick, Kentucky, from which place he made frequent evangelistic trips, and occasional visits to Alexander Campbell at Bethany.[65] In August, 1851, he delivered three eloquent sermons at New Lisbon, the place where he had first preached the Gospel steps a quarter of a century before. Much time during these last years was devoted to his principal work, *The Messiahship,* which was published in 1859. It was highly commended by Campbell as a "very readable, interesting, edifying, cheering, and fascinating volume from his most estimable, companionable and amiable fellow-laborer in the great cause of Reformation."[66] Richardson, probably a better judge than his father-in-law, said: "This work contained many fine thoughts and interesting analyses of the great themes of redemption, and constituted an earnest plea for the union of Christians in the simple primitive faith."[67] Scott finished his work here at Mayslick, about two years later, April 23, 1861.[68]

It is hard to overemphasize his importance to the Disciples of Christ. Alexander Campbell ranked him next to his father.[69] W. T. Moore, one of the leading historians of the movement, summed up Scott's contributions to the Disciples as follows:

---

[65] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 587.
[66] *Ibid.,* II., 641.
[67] *Ibid.,* II., 641.
[68] *Millennial Harbinger,* II., 415.
[69] Davis, M. M. *The Restoration Movement of the Nineteenth Century,* 166.

1. Insistence on the personal element and the preaching of Christ.

2. Insistence that baptism is the consummating act of the sinner's return to God.

3. Emphasis on the promises to baptized believers: remission of sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the hope of eternal life.[70]

In the words of another historian:

"The big four of the current Reformation are Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, Barton W. Stone, and Walter Scott. The last named is fourth in enumeration, but by no means fourth in distinctive importance. In originality of conception, vigor of presentation, enthusiasm, courage, boldness and eloquence he comes near heading the list. He was not the initiator or representative of any organized movement within the church like his three illustrious comrades, but so far as the distinctiveness of his contributions to the new movement was concerned, he stands first in historical and theological importance."[71]

[70] *A Comprehensive History*, 186-189.

[71] Haley, J. J. *Makers and Molders of the Reformation Movement*, 59.

IV

RELATIONS TO OTHER RELIGIOUS BODIES —THE PRESBYTERIANS

WHEN Thomas Campbell landed at Philadelphia in May, 1807, he found the Seceder Synod in session there, and upon presenting his credentials, he was cordially received and immediately assigned to the Presbytery of Chartiers in western Pennsylvania. In this charge in Washington County, he found old friends and acquaintances, and soon became popular with his neighbors. The Seceder congregations were pleased with his earnestness, piety, and ability. Some of his fellow ministers, notwithstanding, soon began to think that he was too liberal in his views. On one occasion, when he was deputed to visit a few scattered members who lived some distance up the Allegheny above Pittsburg, and, aided by a Mr. Wilson, help celebrate communion, he was so touched by the destitute condition of members of other branches of the Presbyterian family, members who had not partaken of the Lord's Supper for years, that he lamented existing party divisions, and suggested that all pious persons who felt willing and prepared enjoy with them the benefits of com-

munion service. Mr. Wilson at the time did not publicly oppose these proceedings, but in private conversations, he discovered that Campbell had little respect for party walls; hence his sectarian prejudices were aroused. At the next meeting of the Presbytery he laid the case before it in the usual form of "libel," the chief charges being that Mr. Campbell did not teach strict adherence to church standards and usages, and that he had even shown disapproval of some things in the standard. The Presbytery censured Campbell for not holding to the "Secession Testimony," but he protested against this decision, and the case was accordingly submitted to the Synod at its next meeting.[1] Knowing that his fellow ministers were unfriendly to him, and feeling that if the decision of the Presbytery were sustained, he would have to sever his connection with the Seceder connection, Campbell addressed an earnest appeal and defence to the Synod. He said:

". . . . It is, therefore, because I have no confidence, either in my own infallibility or in that of others, that I absolutely refuse, as inadmissible and schismatic, the introduction of human opinions and human inventions into the faith and worship of the Church. Is it, therefore, because I plead the cause of the scriptural and apostolic worship of the Church, in opposition to the various errors and schisms which have so awfully corrupted and divided it, that the brethren of the Union should feel it difficult to admit me as their fellow-laborer in that blessed work? I sincerely rejoice with them in what they have done in that way; but still,

[1] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 222-225.

all is not yet done; and surely they can have no just objections to go farther. Nor do I presume to dictate to them or to others as to how they should proceed for the glorious purpose of promoting the unity and purity of the Church; but only beg leave, for my own part, to walk upon such sure and peaceable ground that I may have nothing to do with human controversy, about the right or wrong side of any opinion whatsoever, by simply acquiescing in what is written, as quite sufficient for every purpose of faith and duty; and thereby to influence as many as possible to depart from human controversy, to betake themselves to the Scriptures, and, in so doing, to the study and practice of faith, holiness and love.

"And all this without any intention on my part to judge or despise my Christian brethren who may not see with my eyes in those things which, to me, appear indispensably necessary to promote and secure the unity, peace and purity of the Church. Say, brethren, what is my offence, that I should be thrust out from the heritage of the Lord, or from serving him in that good work to which he has been graciously pleased to call me? For what error or immorality ought I to be rejected, except it be that I refuse to acknowledge as obligatory upon myself, or to impose upon others, anything as of Divine obligation for which I cannot produce a 'Thus saith the Lord!' This, I am sure, I can do, while I keep by his own word; but not quite so sure when I substitute my own meaning or opinion, or that of others, instead thereof."[2]

After the reading of this letter and the presentation of the case before the Synod, that body decided that "there were such informalities in the proceedings of the Presbytery in the trial of the case as to afford sufficient reason to the Synod to

[2] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 227.

set aside their judgment and decision and to release the protester from the censure inflicted by the Presbytery."[3] This they did. A select committee, however, examined all the documents relating to the trial and finally reported that some of Campbell's answers were

> "so evasive and unsatisfactory, and highly equivocal upon great and important articles of revealed religion, as to give ground to conclude that he has expressed sentiments very different upon these articles, and from the sentiments held and professed by this church, and are sufficient grounds to infer censure."[4]

Because he hated to separate from the Seceders, Campbell submitted to the decision, declaring, nevertheless, "that his submission should be understood to mean no more, on his part, than an act of deference to the judgment of the court, that, by so doing, he might not give offence to his brethren by manifesting a refractory spirit."[5] He now hoped to continue his labors in peace, but persecution became more bitter; hence he finally presented to the Synod a formal renunciation of its authority, declaring that he abandoned "all ministerial connection" with it, and would hence forth hold himself "utterly unaffected by its decisions."[6]

In spite of his withdrawal from the Seceders, however, Thomas Campbell continued his minis-

[3] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 229.
[4] *Ibid.*, I., 229.
[5] *Ibid.*, I., 229.
[6] *Ibid.*, I., 230.

terial labors. Because of his great personal influence in Washington and Allegheny Counties, and the novelty and force of the plea which he made for liberality and Christian union based on the Bible alone, large numbers flocked to hear him. Sometimes these meetings were in the shade of a maple grove, but more often they were held at the homes of his old Irish neighbors. Noticing that many of these were regular in their attendance and seemingly convinced of the correctness of his teaching, he proposed a meeting to give more definiteness to the movement in which they were engaged. Since the proposition was received with favor, the meeting was called at the house of Abraham Altars,[7] who lived between Mount Pleasant and Washington.

The leader in this meeting, Thomas Campbell, offered no special objections to confessions of faith. He dissented from little in the Westminster Confession, except the chapter which gave the clergy a position and authority which he considered unauthorized and which had been frequently abused. He knew that most Protestant formularies conceded the Bible to be the only rule of faith and practice; hence he felt that he should exercise the privilege and duty of urging upon all parties the adoption of that concession. In this view, he was encouraged by the many pious and intelligent persons who were dissatisfied with the existing religious parties, sick of petty religious jealousies, and anx-

[7] Altars was not a member of any church, but he was an earnest friend of the movement.

ious for the exaltation of the Bible in preference to man-made creeds.[8]

A rather large audience assembled at the appointed time in the home of Mr. Altars. At the close of an earnest address, Campbell proposed as a rule for all time: "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; and where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent."[9] For quite a while no one moved. Then a shrewd Scotch Seceder, named Andrew Munro, postmaster and bookseller at Canonsburg, arose and said: "Mr. Campbell, if we adopt *that* as a basis, then there is an end of infant baptism."[10] Campbell replied: "Of course, if infant baptism be not found in Scripture, we can have nothing to do with it."[11] Immediately, Thomas Acheson of Washington rose, advanced a short distance, laid his hand on his heart, and said with great feeling: "I hope I may never see the day when my heart will renounce that blessed saying of the Scripture, 'Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.'"[12] He was so deeply moved that he broke into tears, and was leaving the room when James Foster cried out: "Mr. Acheson, I would remark that in the portion of Scripture you have quoted *there is no reference, whatever, to infant baptism.*"[13] Without replying,

[8] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 231-233.
[9] *Ibid.*, I., 236.
[10] *Ibid.*, I., 238.
[11] *Ibid.*, I., 238.
[12] *Ibid.*, I., 238 and *Matthew* 19: 14.
[13] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 238.

Acheson went out to weep alone. After further discussion and conference, the rule was adopted with apparent unanimity, no valid objection being made against it.[14] Concerning the importance of this rule and action, Richardson said:

"It was from the moment when these significant words were uttered and accepted that the more intelligent ever after dated the *formal and actual commencement of the Reformation* which was subsequently carried on with so much success, and which has already produced such important changes in religious society over a large portion of the world."[15]

A few people feared that the conclusion so promptly reached by Andrew Munro concerning infant baptism was correct; hence they began to leave one by one. These defections gave rise to much discussion. James Foster had been convinced while in Ireland that there was no Scriptural foundation for infant baptism, and he was very outspoken in his views. Thomas Campbell, on the other hand, was not yet convinced that the principle adopted necessarily involved any direct opposition to infant baptism. He wanted to leave the question to the individual, to consider it a nonessential, and less important than the great matters of faith and righteousness. One day, while he and Foster were riding along, he urged these views with considerable warmth.[16] Foster finally turned

[14] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 238.
[15] *Ibid.*, I., 237.
[16] *Ibid.*, I., 239, 240.

to him and asked with great emphasis: "Father Campbell, how could you, in the absence of any authority in the Word of God, baptize a child in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit?"[17] Campbell's face colored, he became momentarily irritated, and replied in an offended tone, "Sir, you are the most intractable person I ever met."[18] In spite of these petty differences, however, the men were united in the object of promoting Christian union and peace in the religious world. In order to realize that aim more effectually they organized themselves into a regular association under the name of "The Christian Association" of Washington, at a meeting held at the headwaters of Buffalo, August 17, 1809, and also appointed a committee of twenty-one to meet and confer together, and, with the assistance of Thomas Campbell, to find the proper means to effect the objects of the Association.[19]

In as much as the services held in the private homes were found to be inconvenient, the members decided to provide a regular place of worship. The neighbors accordingly assembled and erected a log building on the Sinclair farm, some three miles from Mount Pleasant and on the road from Washington at the place where it was crossed by the

[17] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 240.

[18] *Ibid.*, I., 240.

[19] This association, in spite of the disclaimers of the leaders and the fact that the Brush Run Church was not organized until May 4, 1811, really marked the beginning of the church which is now officially designated "Disciples of Christ."

road from Middletown to Canonsburg. In this house Thomas Campbell continued to meet his hearers regularly. At a nearby home, that of a Mr. Welch, he roomed; here in a quiet upstairs room he pursued his studies and wrote the epoch making *Declaration and Address.* When this was finished, he called a special meeting of the leading members, and read it to them for their approval and adoption. Since they unanimously approved the document, it was immediately ordered printed.[20] In as much as it was and still is of very great importance because of its ardent and powerful appeal for unity on the practice of the primitive New Testament Church, rather extensive quotations are given:

". . . . Ministers of Jesus, you can neither be ignorant of nor unaffected with the divisions and corruptions of his church. His dying commands, his last and ardent prayers for the visible unity of his professing people, will not suffer you to be indifferent in this matter. You will not, you cannot, therefore, be silent upon a subject of such vast importance to his personal glory and the happiness of his people—consistently you cannot; for silence gives consent. You will rather lift up your voice like a trumpet to expose the heinous nature and dreadful consequences of those unnatural and anti christian divisions, which have so rent and ruined the Church of God. Thus, in justice to your station and character, honored of the Lord, would we hopefully anticipate your zealous and faithful efforts to heal the breaches of Zion; that God's dear children might dwell to-gether in unity and love; but if otherwise . . . forbear to utter it (see Mal. 2: 1-10).

[20] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 241, 242.

"O! that ministers and people would but consider that there are no divisions in the grave, nor in that world which lies beyond it! there our divisions must come to an end! we must all unite there! Would to God we could find in our hearts to put an end to our short lived divisions here; that so we might leave a blessing behind us; even a happy and united church. What gratification, what utility, in the meantime, can our divisions afford, either to ministers or people? Should they be perpetuated till the day of judgment, would they convert one sinner from the error of his ways, or save a soul from death? Have they any tendency to hide the multitude of sins that are so dishonorable to God, and hurtful to his people? Do they not rather irritate and produce them? How innumerable and highly aggravated are the sins they have produced, and are at this day producing, both among professors and profane. We entreat, we beseech you then dear brethren, by all those considerations, to concur in this blessed and dutiful attempt. What is the work of all, must be done by all. . . ."[21]

Thirteen important propositions were advanced:

"1. That the Church of Christ upon earth is essentially, intentionally, and constitutionally one; consisting of all those in every place that profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him in all things according to the Scriptures and that manifest the same by their tempers and conduct, and of none else; as none else can be truly and properly called Christians."[22]

2. This article emphasized the duty of co-operation and unity among the particular and distinct societies of the Church of Christ on earth.

[21] Young, C. A. *Historical Documents Advocating Christian Union*, 100-102.

[22] *Ibid.*, 103.

3. In order to make that union possible nothing should be required of Christians as articles of faith or terms of communion but what was clearly taught and "enjoined upon them" in the Bible.

"4. That although the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are inseparably connected, making together but one perfect and entire revelation of the Divine will, for the edification and salvation of the Church, and therefore in that respect can not be separated; yet as to what directly and properly belong to their immediate object, the New Testament is as perfect a constitution for the worship, discipline, and government of the New Testament church, as the Old Testament was for the worship, discipline, and government of the Old Testament church, and the particular duties of its members." [23]

5. This article declared against man made laws, and said that nothing should be received into the faith or worship or made a term of communion among Christians unless it were as old as the New Testament.

"6. No . . . deductions or inferential truths ought to have any place in the church's confession." [24]

7. The seventh proposition declared that doctrinal exhibitions of Divine truths and testimonies opposed to prevailing error were expedient, but

[23] Young, C. A. *Historical Documents . . .*, 109.
[24] *Ibid.*, 110.

that they should not be made terms of communion, for they necessarily contained inferential truths.

8. The eighth article stated that a knowledge of the lost and perishing condition and of the way of salvation through Christ, accompanied by a profession of faith in and shown by obedience to Christ in all things according to the Bible was all that was necessary for admission into His church.

9. All who have made such a profession should mutually love and help each other.

"10. That divisions among the Christians is a horrid evil, fraught with many evils. It is anti Christian, as it destroys the visible unity of the body of Christ; as if he were divided against himself, excluding and excommunicating a part of himself. It is anti scriptural, as being strictly prohibited by his sovereign authority; a direct violation of his express command. It is anti natural, as it excites Christians to contemn, to hate, and oppose one another, who are bound by the highest and most endearing obligations to love each other as brethren, even as Christ has loved them. In a word, it is productive of confusion and of every evil work."[25]

"11. That (in some instances) a partial neglect of the expressly revealed will of God, and (in others) an assumed authority for making the approbation of human opinions and human inventions a term of communion, by introducing them into the

[25] Young, C. A. *Historical Documents . . .*, 112, 113.

constitution, faith, or worship of the church, are, and have been, the immediate, obvious, and universally acknowledged causes, of all the corruptions and divisions that ever have taken place in the Church of God.

"12. That all that is necessary to the highest state of perfection and purity of the Church upon earth is, first, that none be received as members but such as having that due measure of Scriptural self knowledge described above, do profess that faith in Christ and obedience to him in all things according to the Scriptures; nor secondly, that any be retained in her communion longer than they continue to manifest the reality of their profession by their temper and conduct. Thirdly, that her ministers, duly and Scripturally qualified, inculcate none other things than those very articles of faith and holiness expressly revealed and enjoined in the word of God. Lastly, that in all their administrations they keep close by the observance of all Divine ordinances, after the example of the primitive church, exhibited in the New Testament; without any additions whatsoever of human opinions or inventions of men.

"13. Lastly. That if any circumstantials indispensably necessary to the observance of Divine ordinances be not found upon the page of express revelation, such, and such only, as are absolutely necessary for this purpose should be adopted under the title of human expedients, without any pretense to a more sacred origin, so that any subse-

quent alteration or difference in the observance of these things might produce no contention nor division in the church.''[26]

One of the most noteworthy things about this *Address* was that the society did not at all recognize itself as a *church*, but simply as an organization for the promotion of Christian union. Neither Thomas Campbell nor any one associated with him, however, realized all that was involved in the principles advocated. The *Address* expressly stated:

> ''We have no nostrum, no peculiar discovery of our own, to propose to fellow-Christians, for the fancied importance of which they should become followers of us. We propose to patronize nothing but the inculcation of the express Word of God, either as to matter of faith or practice; but every one that has a Bible, and can read it, can read this for himself. Therefore, we have nothing new. Neither do we pretend to acknowledge persons to be ministers of Christ, and at the same time, consider it our duty to forbid or discourage people to go to hear them, merely because they may hold some things disagreeable to us, much less to encourage their people to leave them on that account.''[27]

In the pamphlet all possible objections were so fully but kindly refuted that ''no attempt was ever made by the opposers of the proposed movement to controvert directly a single position which it contained.''[28] The work had been completed when Alexander Campbell reached this country, but the

---

[26] Young, C. A. *Historical Documents . . .*, 113, 114. The whole *Address*, with appendices, etc., is found on pages 71-209.

[27] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 263, 264.

[28] *Ibid.*, I., 278.

son was one of the first to read the proof sheets. He at once gave it his approval, for the thirteen propositions expressed clearly the convictions which he had reached in Scotland. Not long afterwards, when his father inquired as to his plans for the future, he told him that he had decided to devote his life to the support of the principles and views expressed in the *Declaration and Address*. He felt the call of duty so strongly that he refused a flattering offer of $1000 a year and other inducements to take charge of an academy in Pittsburg.[29] He determined, moreover, never to receive compensation for his ministerial work, even though his father declared, "Upon these principles, my dear son, I fear you will have to wear many a ragged coat."[30]

After Thomas Campbell learned his son's intention of devoting himself to the ministry, he advised him to study the Bible carefully and persistently for six months. In following his father's advice with regard to studies, the son arranged the following daily program for his spare time during the winter of 1810:

Study of Greek from 8 to 9 each morning.
Study of Latin from 11 to 12 each morning.
One-half hour for the study of Hebrew—between 12 and 1.

[29] In 1810 this city had a population of 4740 living in some 767 houses, eleven of which were stone, 283 brick and 473 frame and log. At the time of Alexander Campbell's death in 1866, the population was about 125,000 (Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 247, 275).

[30] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 275. It is only fair to remark that Alexander Campbell was not yet rich when he reached this decision.

Two hours for memorizing ten verses of Scripture and reading the same in the original language with Henry and Scott's notes and observations.

Other reading and studies as time permits, with special reference to church history.[31]

In May, 1810, in obedience to his father's request, Alexander Campbell gave his first exhortation, and on July 15, of the same year, he delivered his first sermon, which was based on *Matthew* 7:24-27. This effort was a decided success; hence his services were soon in continuous demand. During the first year, he preached one hundred and six times. He committed these early sermons word for word, but he soon gave up this practice, and relied upon notes or entirely on memory.[32] The father early began to respect the abilities and judgment of his son, but on October 2, 1810, against the advice of that son, he petitioned to the Synod of Pittsburg, meeting at Washington, to be received into communion. The elder Campbell's motive was good —he hated to cause division. The result, however, justified the wisdom of the son, for the Synod refused the request. Since Thomas Campbell insisted on reasons being given, the Synod determined to return the following answer to his inquiry:

"It was not for any immorality in practice, but, in addition to the reasons before assigned, for expressing his belief that there are some opinions taught in our Confession of Faith which are not founded in the Bible, and avoiding

[31] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 278, 279.
[32] *Ibid.*, I., 312-326.

to designate them; for declaring that the administration of baptism to infants is not authorized by scriptural precept or example, and is a matter of indifference, yet administering that ordinance while holding such an opinion; for encouraging or countenancing his son to preach the gospel without any regular authority; for opposing creeds and confessions as injurious to the interests of religion; and, also, because it is not consistent with the regulations of the Presbyterian Church that Synod should form a connection with any ministers, churches or associations; that the Synod deemed it improper to grant his request.'' [33]

The minutes of the Synod continued:

''On reading the above to Mr. Campbell, he denied having said that infant baptism was a matter of indifference, and declared that he admitted many truths drawn by fair induction from the Word of God; acknowledged that he opposed creeds and confessions when they contained anything not expressly contained in the Bible; that he believes there are some things in our Confession of Faith not expressly revealed in the Bible. He also declared that he felt himself quite relieved from the apprehension, which he at first had with respect to his moral character.'' [34]

With the exception of Alexander Campbell, the members of the Association seemed willing to let the Synod's action pass, for they desired to avoid religious controversy. The young minister, however, announced a discourse for November 1, 1810, on the principles and designs of the Association ''for the purpose of obviating certain mistakes and objections which ignorance or willful opposition has

[33] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 328.
[34] *Ibid.*, I., 328.

attached to the humble and well-meant attempts of the Society to promote a thorough scriptural reformation, as testified in their address to the friends and lovers of peace and truth throughout all the churches.''[35] A large audience assembled at the appointed time and place. Campbell in a long and well received discourse considered the following charges:

1. The principle and plan adopted have a tendency to increase divisions, and to terminate in a new party.

2. The plan tends to degrade the ministerial character.

3. It opens a door to corruption in discipline.

4. A nominal approbation of the Bible is made a satisfactory test of truth.

5. The principles adopted exclude infant baptism.

6. The plan tends to establish independent church government.

7. It opens a door for lay preaching.

A few other charges, namely, that the principles of the Association would exclude females from the Lord's table, and would abrogate the Sabbath were also made.[36]

A study of this discourse shows the following things with regard to the views of the Campbells:

1. That they believed the religious parties had the substance of Christianity, but not ''the form of

[35] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 335.
[36] *Ibid.,* I., 335-347.

sound words," and that the main purpose of the proposed reformation was the abolition of every human system, and the adoption of "this form of sound words" as the basis of union.

2. That they considered each church an independent organization, with its own internal government by bishops and deacons, but not so independent of other churches as to exclude fraternal relations.

3. That they believed lay preaching authorized, and denied a Scriptural distinction between clergy and laity.

4. That they regarded infant baptism as without direct Scriptural authority, but as a matter of forbearance, allowable even as Paul and James for a while permitted circumcision because of Jewish prejudices.

5. That they foresaw the possibility of being forced to turn the Christian Association into a separate church "in order to carry out for themselves the duties and obligations enjoined on them in the Scriptures.

"6. That is receiving nothing but what was expressly revealed, they foresaw and admitted that many things deemed precious and important by the existing religious societies, must inevitably be excluded."[87]

A little later, Alexander Campbell, when pressed for reasons, said that he did not dare to be a party man because:

---

[87] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 348, 349.

1. Christ had forbidden it.

2. No party would receive into communion all whom God would receive into heaven, that God loved his children more than he did man's creeds, and that the Bible was made for man, and not man for the Bible. Anticipating a question, he declared that he could not join a party and let those things alone, for:

3. The man who promoted the interests of a party stood next in guilt to the man who made it.

4. All parties opposed reformation. "They all pray for it, but they will not work for it. None of them dare return to the original standard. I speak not against any denomination in particular, but against *all*. I speak not against any system of truth, but against all *except the Bible*. . . ."[38]

About this time, Alexander Campbell formed the acquaintance of a Mr. John Brown, a wealthy farmer friend of his father. This rich agriculturist became his father-in-law on March 12, 1811, when he married Margaret Brown. One evening, just before this marriage, Mr. Brown managed to start a debate on baptism between Alexander Campbell and a traveling Baptist minister. The controversy waxed warm. The speakers compared the Christian and Jewish institutions. Campbell took up the cause of pedobaptism with more than usual skill, but the direct Scripture quotations of his opponent baffled him; hence he took the position

[38] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 353, 354.

that infant baptism, like circumcision in the early church, should be considered a matter of forbearance. The close communion Baptist vigorously attacked this claim, and the talk was prolonged until near morning. Before separating, the debaters agreed to meet again in two weeks in order to continue the discussion. The meeting took place at the appointed time, but Campbell did not feel satisfied with the arguments which he had prepared; consequently he asked for a further adjournment. The debate was never renewed.[39]

Since Thomas Campbell soon came to the conclusion that it was necessary to form an independent church because of the attitude the religious bodies had taken, the question was considered and agreed to at the next meeting of the Association. He then proposed that each person should be required to give a satisfactory answer to the question, "What is the meritorious cause of a sinner's acceptance with God?"[40] Most answered satisfactorily, but two did not; hence their admission was postponed. Both later proved unworthy, and were denied admission. James Foster did not attend this meeting; therefore, when all assembled Saturday, May 4, 1811, for the purpose of organization, the question came up, "Is James Foster a member, not having been present at the time the test question was propounded?"[41] Alexander Campbell, who

[39] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 354-363.
[40] *Ibid.*, I., 367.
[41] *Ibid.*, I., 367.

was not convinced that there was authority for such a test, arose at once and said: "Certainly James Foster is a member, having been with us from the beginning, and his religious sentiments being perfectly well known to all."[42] The test question, consequently, was not asked him nor any one else thereafter.

At this meeting Thomas Campbell was appointed elder, Alexander Campbell was licensed to preach the Gospel, and four deacons were chosen. On the next day the church held its first communion service, and the newly licensed minister preached from *John* 6:48, "I am that bread of life." The speaker discussed the communion service, and the duties and joys of a Christian in celebrating the Lord's Supper. Some of the members noticed, however, that Joseph Bryant and one or two others who had given satisfactory answers to the test question did not commune. When the first was asked for a reason, he replied that he did not consider himself authorized to partake, because he had never been baptized. This proved to be the case with the other two members—Margaret Fullerton, whose father had been a Baptist, and Abraham Altars, whose father had been a deist. The question of baptism thus assumed a new and more practical aspect.[43]

The elder Campbell had serious scruples about baptizing those who had already been recognized

[42] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 367.
[43] *Ibid.*, I., 367-372.

as members of the church, but he had no objections to baptizing the three mentioned above, for not one of them had received baptism in any of its so-called forms. Neither did he appear to have any doubt in regard to immersion, for he at once agreed with Joseph Bryant that it alone was baptism. He said: "Water is water; and earth is earth. We certainly could not call a person buried in earth if only a little dust were sprinkled on him."[44] Without hesitation, therefore, he consented to perform the ceremony, which occurred July 4, 1811, in a deep pool of Buffalo Creek, about two miles above the mouth of Brush Run, on the farm of David Bryant. The pool here was narrow, but the water came up to the shoulders of the candidates. Campbell stood on a root that projected over the edge of the pool, bent down the heads of the candidates until they were completely covered, and at the same time repeated the baptismal formula. James Foster did not entirely approve this method. Neither did he think it fitting that one not scripturally baptized should immerse others. Nevertheless, Thomas Campbell, who had been the first to introduce the reformatory movement, became the first to introduce immersion,[45] which soon became a distinguishing mark in the advance of that movement.[46]

[44] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 372.

[45] Barton W. Stone, about 1804, had attempted to convince Robert Marshall that pedobaptism was right, but had himself been converted to "believer's immersion" (Rogers, J. R. *The Cane Ridge Meeting House, Autobiography*, 182, 183).

[46] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 372, 373. Affairs were not entirely smooth for the new church at Brush Run.

The question of infant baptism, so frequently mentioned, had not been as carefully considered by Alexander Campbell as it should have been. True, while discussing the *Declaration and Address* with his father, he had asked if infant baptism would not have to be given up. The inquiry had perhaps been suggested by a conversation with a Mr. Riddle of the Presbyterian Union church. The latter had said of the *Declaration and Address:* "Sir, these words, however plausible in appearance, are not sound. For if you follow these out, you must become a Baptist." "Why, sir," replied Campbell, "is there in the Scriptures no express precept, nor precedent for infant baptism?" "Not one, sir," was the answer.[47] Campbell was mortified because he could not find such a reference. He immediately ordered from Andrew Munro, the principal book seller of Canonsburg, all the treatises he had in favor of infant baptism. He asked for no books on the other side, for at that time he knew little of the Baptists and regarded them as ignorant and uneducated. He, of course, had often read John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress,* but he had not yet learned that Bunyan was a Baptist. He took the question

[47] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 250.

Many who had been identified with the Christian Association became indifferent. Others who still sympathized with the movement hesitated about entering into a church relation. Many, on account of distance and other obstacles, were unable to attend the meetings. Because of these hindrances the church could count on only about thirty regular members, who met by turns at the Crossroads and Brush Run. Common ties and opposition, however, threw these members into closer relationship and gave them greater zeal than usual.

up with his father, but the latter replied: "We make our appeal to the law, and to the testimony. Whatever is not found therein we must of course abandon."[48]

In spite of reading only Pædobaptist authorities, however, with his prejudices in favor of infant baptism, the conviction grew stronger that such baptism was entirely a human invention. He cast his books aside, and turned to his Greek New Testament, but this only made the matter worse. Again he went to his father, and found himself willing to admit that there were neither "express terms" nor "precedent" to authorize the practice. Nevertheless, he declared:

> "As for those who are already members of the Church and participants of the Lord's Supper, I can see no propriety, even if the scriptural evidence for infant baptism be found deficient, in their unchurching or paganizing themselves, or in putting off Christ, merely for the sake of making a new profession; thus going out of the Church merely for the sake of coming in again."[49]

Because of his father's wishes, however, he seemed willing to concede only that they ought not to teach or practice infant baptism without Biblical authority, and that they should preach and practice apostolic baptism for all who made the first profession of their faith.[50] The question thus remained in abeyance for a while, but on March 13,

[48] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 251.
[49] *Ibid.*, I., 251.
[50] *Ibid.*, I., 251-253.

1812, Alexander Campbell's first child—Jane—was born. Since the mother and her father were still members of the Presbyterian Church, the question of infant baptism became of more immediate importance to the Campbells.

The matter widened in scope also. The earlier attitude of both father and son has probably been sufficiently indicated, but another instance will be given. Alexander Campbell had preached on texts dealing with baptism on February 3, 1810, May 19, 1811, and on June 5, 1811. On the latter occasion, he had distinctly remarked: "As I am sure it is unscriptural to make this matter a term of communion, I let it *slip*. I wish to think and let think on these matters."[51] Many members of his church, however, began to think that too little attention was given to baptism, and he gradually came to the same conclusion himself. He studied his Bible carefully, and searched out critically in the original Greek the meaning of the words rendered "baptism" and "baptize." The question with him was no longer, "May we safely reject infant baptism as a human invention?" but, "May we omit *believer's baptism,* which all admit to be divinely commanded?"[52] He finally decided that the rite of sprinkling, to which he had involuntarily submitted as a youth, was entirely unauthorized, and that he, therefore, was an unbaptized person and could not preach baptism to others.

[51] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 392.
[52] *Ibid.,* I., 394.

Having reached this conclusion, Alexander Campbell immediately determined to submit to the rite. He went to Matthias Luce, a Baptist minister with whom he had formed an acquaintance. Luce lived on the other side of his father's farm; hence the son stopped off for a brief visit with his father. His sister, Dorothea, took him aside, told him that she was not satisfied with her baptism, and asked him to take the matter up with her father. Contrary to expectation, Thomas Campbell offered no particular objection. He merely asked Alexander to get Mr. Luce to call with him on his way down. After some difficulty the Baptist minister was induced to perform the ceremony after the New Testament pattern (as interpreted by Alexander Campbell), and thus without a call for religious experiences. On June 12, 1812, the intention having been publicly announced, the baptismal ceremony was performed at the same place where the first three baptisms had been made. Seven persons were immersed—Alexander Campbell and his wife, Thomas Campbell, his wife and daughter Dorothea, and a Mr. and Mrs. James Hanen.[53]

[53] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 394-398; *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 406. Thomas Campbell delivered a long discourse in which he admitted that he had been led to overlook the importance of baptism in his effort to attain Christian unity upon the Bible alone. Alexander Campbell followed with an extended defence of their whole proceedings. The ceremony lasted seven hours. Joseph Bryant left just before it began in order to attend a muster of volunteers for the war against Great Britain, which it was reported Congress had declared June 4, 1812, two weeks earlier than the actual declaration. Nevertheless, he returned in time to hear an hour's preaching and see the baptisms.

The importance of this baptismal service is hard to overestimate. It reversed the position of father and son. Up to June 12, 1812, the father had been the leader. He had penned the *Declaration and Address,* to whose principles the son had given allegiance; he had led in the organization of Brush Run church. The son, however, was the first to recognize the place of baptism, and from that time became the real leader. He was the right man in the right place. The great mission of the father had ended; he had propounded and developed the true basis of union; he had overcome obstacles that thousands of others would have fallen before, but he found it difficult to advance beyond the general principles laid down in the *Declaration and Address.* His son, however, blessed with youth, decision, untrammeled views, and a conscientious mental independence inherited largely from his Huguenot mother, assumed the leadership and pushed the "Reformation" to success. He became the master spirit; to him all eyes were turned. He believed that God called him to lead; his conscience drove him irresistibly forward. On neither side, though, was there the least rivalry. Each filled fully his assigned place; each co-operated heartily, sympathetically, and lovingly with the other.

At the next meeting of the Brush Run Church, the Lord's Day following the baptism, thirteen others requested immersion, one of them, James Foster, and were baptized by Thomas Campbell. Others requested immersion from time to time,

among the number, General Acheson.[54] Still another result of these early baptisms was the closer connection with the Baptists. Since Brush Run became a church of immersed believers, it soon entered the Redstone Baptist Association, and became with its leader Baptist.[55]

---

[54] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 401-403.
[55] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 406.

V

RELATIONS TO OTHER RELIGIOUS BODIES—BAPTISTS

AS intimated in the previous chapter, the agreement on the method of baptism brought the followers of the Campbells and the Baptists into closer contact. These two leaders began to form acquaintances among the latter, whom they liked far better than their ministers.[1] Concerning the preachers in the Red Stone Association, Alexander Campbell said some very bitter things, as:

"They were little men in a big office. The office did not fit them. They had a wrong idea, too, of what was wanting. They seemed to think that a change of apparel—a black coat instead of a drab—a broad rim on their hat instead of a narrow one—a prolongation of the face and a fictitious gravity—a longer and more emphatic pronunciation of certain words, rather than scriptural knowledge, humility, spirituality, zeal and Christian affection, with great devotion and great philanthropy, were the grand desiderata."[2]

Later he remarked: "They had but one, two, or, at the most, three sermons, and these were either

[1] Gates, Errett. *The Early Relation and Separation of Baptists and Disciples*, 19.

[2] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 439.

delivered in one uniform style and order, or minced down into one medley by way of variety.''[3] With regard to the people, he declared:

> ''I confess, however, that I was better pleased with the Baptist people than with any other community. They read the Bible, and seemed to care for little else in religion than 'conversion' and 'Bible doctrine.' They often sent for us and pressed us to preach for them. We visited some of their churches, and, on acquaintance liked the people more and the preachers less.''[4]

Campbell believed, however, that because of education and training he might be prejudiced against the Baptist clergy; hence he visited their association at Uniontown, Pennsylvania, in the fall of 1812. He was disgusted, and declined, with one exception, all invitations to preach. He returned home determined never to visit another association, but he soon learned that the Baptists themselves regarded the preachers of that association as worse than ordinary, and their discourses as unedifying. Since they continued to urge him to come to their churches and preach for them, he often visited their congregations within a sixty-mile radius. All of these churches urged the Reformers to join the Red Stone Association. In the fall of 1813, Campbell accordingly laid the matter before his church, which, after much discussion, decided to make overtures to the association, and to write out in full their sentiments, wishes and determinations on that

[3] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 439.
[4] *Ibid.*, I., 440.

subject. This document[5] revealed their remonstrances against human creeds, but expressed a willingness to co-operate or unite with the Red Stone Association, provided "no terms of union or communion, other than the Holy Scriptures, should be required."[6] The proposition was discussed at the association, and a considerable majority was given in favor of the reception of the Brush Run Church. Nevertheless, there was a determined minority opposed to this resolution: Elder Pritchard of Cross Creek, Virginia; Elder Brownfield of Uniontown, Pennsylvania; Elder Stone of Ohio; and the latter's son, Elder Stone of the Monongahela region. These men apparently confederated against Campbell and his followers, but for two or three years their efforts accomplished little.[7]

Not long after the Brush Run Church had joined the Red Stone Association, Thomas Campbell moved about ninety miles west, near Cambridge, Ohio. He was accompanied by Joseph Bryant, who had married his oldest daughter, Dorothea, and by John Chapman, who had married his second daughter, Nancy. His sons-in-law assisted him in the management of the farm, and of a flourishing seminary which he opened. Alexander Campbell remained at Mr. Brown's, and with the help of James Foster cared for the Brush Run

[5] Campbell did not preserve a copy, and the clerk of the Association later refused him one.

[6] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 311.

[7] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 441.

Church. Quite a number of people came into this congregation, among them being Campbell's father-in-law and mother-in-law. Many lived too far away to attend regularly, however, and removals were frequent. Infected somewhat by the prevailing spirit of migration, the members of the church began to consider seriously the question of removing in a body to a more suitable place. Accordingly, a meeting was called, April 13, 1814, to consider the matter. The following reasons were urged for removal:

1. The scattered condition of membership, which prevented regularity of attendance.

2. Opposition from other religious bodies.

3. The difficulty of securing good schools and teachers for their children.

4. The hard labor required in order to support their families.

The meeting decided that a removal was desirable, and concluded that the best situation would be near a flourishing town, but not more than two hundred miles west, for they did not want to get too near the Indian border. Such a location, they thought, would give them better opportunities of usefulness and furnish work for the artisans, while the remainder, who were farmers, could secure land in the vicinity. Then, too, all could enjoy the privilege of good schools for their children. A committee of George Archer, Richard McConnel, Abraham Altars, John Cockens, and Alexander Campbell was appointed to explore and report on a

suitable location. After having visited a large part of Ohio, the committee decided in favor of Zanesville.[8] Returning, they submitted an elaborate written report to the church, and on June 8, 1814, the congregation decided unanimously that the report be accepted and that the removal should take place as soon as the necessary arrangements could be made.[9]

Alexander Campbell favored this plan, but his father-in-law, for whose judgment he entertained great respect, had little sympathy for the project. Moreover, Mr. Brown did not want his son-in-law and daughter to move so far away. Then, too, he wanted to retire from the farm and take up an easier mode of life. Accordingly, he gave Campbell a deed in fee simple to his fine farm.[10] As a result the latter felt compelled to remain where he was, and the others, unwilling to go without him, decided to stay also. Campbell threw himself into farm work with a will, and soon won the respect of the farmers of the vicinity. His ability as a practical and intelligent farmer thus helped lessen the prejudices of the Presbyterians and Methodists, who were strong in that neighborhood. Raised to a position of independence, he put his farm into good repair; made such changes as would allow him

[8] Zanesville has one of the oldest and strongest churches among the Disciples of Christ.

[9] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 458-461.

[10] Mr. Brown moved to Charlestown, where he entered the grocery business. He became a member of the Baptist Church at Cross Roads, three miles above Charlestown.

to be away from home; and, during the rest of 1814 and 1815, carried on his ministerial labors with renewed zeal.[11]

During the period while Alexander Campbell was very busy on the farm, his father was working equally hard in his seminary at Cambridge. Near the close of 1815, however, a letter came to the latter from General Acheson urging the elder Campbell to come to Washington to be with his brother, who had been attacked by a serious illness accompanied by a mental disturbance. Acheson thought that the presence of an old friend might aid in soothing his brother. The elder Campbell left his school in charge of assistants, and went at once to Washington. While there, he heard of a favorable opportunity for a school in Pittsburg, and a better chance for religious usefulness than he had found at Cambridge, where prejudices, worldliness, and gayety gave little promise for the success of religious reformation. A flourishing school was opened in Pittsburg. Joseph Bryant helped for some time in this work, and Campbell's other son-in-law, John Chapman, opened another school in the suburbs. The latter, however, soon returned to Washington County, where he had inherited a fine farm.[12]

Late in November, 1815, about the time his father left Cambridge, Alexander Campbell proposed to the few members of the church living in

[11] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 461, 462.
[12] *Ibid.*, I., 463.

Wellsburg that a building be erected there, for the town had no public place of worship, and all meetings were held in the courthouse. Morcover, he offered to give three or four months' time for soliciting part of the needed funds. Since the proposition was received with favor, he left home December 12, 1815, and reached Pittsburg two days later. Here he spent the evening with his father at the home of Mr. Richardson, who became the first contributor to the fund by a twenty dollar gift. On the next day, December 15, he took the stage for Philadelphia. In traversing this route, upon his first arrival in the country six years before, he had noticed particularly the beauty of the country and the fine views from the mountains. They were not unnoticed now, but the quality of the lands, the farm improvements, the houses and barns, the flourishing villages, and the vast mineral resources were the chief objects of his attention. He was particularly pleased with the fine farms and buildings, the rich groves of locusts, and the fertility of the land in Lancaster County. He was proud of the country of his adoption.[13] On December 28, 1815, he wrote to his uncle Archibald Campbell at Newry:

"I cannot speak too highly of the advantages that the people in this country enjoy in being delivered from a proud

[13] Though he took little interest in politics, he had, in 1811, taken the necessary steps to secure naturalization, and at the end of the two year period then required had become a citizen (Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 464, 465).

and lordly aristocracy; and here it becomes very easy to trace the common national evils of all European countries to their proper source, and chiefly to the first germ of oppression, of civil and religious tyranny. I have had my horse shod by a legislator, my horse saddled, my boots cleaned, my stirrup held by a senator. Here is no nobility but virtue; here there is no ascendance save that of genius, virtue and knowledge. The farmer here is lord of the soil, and the most independent man on earth. . . . No consideration that I can conceive of, would induce me to exchange all that I enjoy in this country, climate, soil and government, for any situation which your country can afford. I would not exchange the honor and privilege of being an American citizen for the position of your king.'' [14]

While in Philadelphia on this mission to raise funds for a meeting house in Wellsburg, formerly known as Charlestown, Campbell was invited by a Baptist preacher to fill his pulpit. The sermon, however, was so different in matter and style from the usual sermons that the congregation was wakened by the novelty, and the regular minister did not know how to regard the discourse and awakening. When he met Mr. Campbell the next day, he voiced his dissatisfaction. His visitor thereupon suggested that possibly he did not fully understand the sermon, for the time had been too short for a clear and full discussion of the questions considered. The Baptist minister at once requested him to make another appointment. The second discourse presented still more strongly the truths of the Gospel as interpreted by the speaker.

[14] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 465, 466.

The host was so offended that he did not give his congregation another chance to hear the visiting clergyman, although many of them desired it.

On leaving Philadelphia, Campbell went to Trenton and other towns in New Jersey, to New York, and to Washington City.[15] The eastern trip brought in about $1,000 for the building at Wellsburg.[16] With this amount and the aid received in Charlestown and neighborhood a lot was purchased at the upper end of the main street, and a good brick church with the usual high pulpit was erected. The building of this meeting house gave great offence to Elder Pritchard, minister of the Cross Creek Baptist Church three miles above. He was one of the men who had already shown his hostility to the Campbells, and he now seemed to believe that the erection of this church was meant to weaken his influence and lessen his congregation.[17]

This bigotry and petty personal jealousy became marked at the meeting of the Association at Cross Creek, August 30, 1816. Alexander Campbell recognized the feeling; hence he remarked to his wife, "I do not think they will let me preach at this Association at all."[18] Some of the ministers, nevertheless, were favorable, and the people were so anxious to hear him that on Saturday he was nominated with others to preach the following day.

---

[15] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 467, 468.
[16] *Millennial Harbinger,* II., 406.
[17] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 469.
[18] *Ibid.,* I., 470.

Elder Pritchard now interfered, saying that he thought they ought to conform to the rule adopted in Maryland, which gave the church where the association met the privilege of selecting the speakers for the Lord's Day, and that those should be chosen among the ministers who came from a distance. He continued: "This place is near Mr. Campbell's home, and the people can hear him at any time."[19] Consequently the name of Elder Stone was substituted for that of Campbell, and the latter returned to Charlestown in the evening, with the belief that the matter was definitely settled. On the next morning, however, one of the best of the Baptist preachers, David Phillips of Peters Creek, came to Campbell, and said that he had been asked by a large number of people to insist that Mr. Campbell preach. The latter replied that he had no objections to preaching, but that he would not violate the rule of the association. Phillips left disappointed, but soon returned to say that Elder Stone was sick, and to urge Campbell to take his place. The latter consented, provided Elder Pritchard would extend the invitation. When the young minister rode up to Cross Creek, the first person he met at the bridge was Pritchard, who said: "I have taken the very earliest opportunity to see you in order to say that you must preach to-day."[20] After learning that Pritchard had talked with Phillips, Campbell consented, and de-

[19] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 470.
[20] *Ibid.*, I., 471.

livered the second sermon with *Romans* 8:3 as a text: "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh."

Since the *Sermon on the Law* is considered by many to mark the beginning of the separate independent movement for union, as it marks the beginning of the separation from the Baptists,[21] it should be considered somewhat in detail. Campbell's method was:

1. Determine what ideas were attached to the phrase "the law" in the text and in other parts of the Bible.
2. Show what the law could not do.
3. Explain why the law failed to accomplish these objects.
4. Illustrate how God remedied the defects of the law.
5. Draw accurate and reasonable conclusions.[22]

He pointed out that the law included the whole Mosaic dispensation, but he was careful to declare:

"There are two principles, commandments or laws that are never included in our observations concerning the law of Moses, nor are they ever, in Holy Writ, called the law of Moses: These are, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, soul, mind and strength; and thy neighbor as thyself.' These our Great Prophet teaches us are the basis of the law of Moses and of the prophets. 'On these two

[21] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 406.
[22] Young, C. A. *Historical Documents*, 224, 225.

commandments hang all the law and the prophets.' Indeed the Sinai law and all Jewish laws are but modifications of them. These are of universal and immutable obligation.''[23]

He declared that the law could not do the following things:

1. Give righteousness and life.
2. Show the malignity of sin.
3. Be a suitable rule of life to mankind in this imperfect state.[24]

He then went on to show that the law was given to the Jewish nation alone, and that God remedied all its defects with the Gospel by sending His Son. He drew the following conclusions from his discourse:

''1st. From what has been said, it follows that there is an essential difference between law and gospel—the Old Testament and the New. No two words are more distinct in their signification than *law* and *gospel*. They are contradistinguished under various names in the New Testament. The law is denominated 'the letter', 'the ministration of condemnation', 'the ministration of death', 'the Old Testament or Covenant', and 'Moses.' The gospel is denominated 'the Spirit', 'the ministration of righteousness', 'the New Testament, or Covenant,' 'the law of liberty and Christ.' In respect of existence or duration, the former is denominated 'that which is done away'—the latter, 'that which remaineth'—the former was faulty, the latter faultless—the former demanded, this bestows righteousness—that gendered bondage, this liberty—that begat bond-slaves, this freemen—the former spake on this wise, 'This do and thou shalt live'—this says, 'Say not what ye shall do; the word is

[23] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 473.
[24] Young, C. A. *Historical Documents . . .*, 235-237.

nigh thee (that gives life), the word of faith which we preach: if thou believe in thine heart the gospel, thou shalt be saved. The former waxed old, is abolished, and vanished away—the latter remains, lives, and is everlasting.' ''[25]

''2d. In the second place, we learn from what has been said, that 'there is no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.' The premises from which the Apostle drew this conclusion are the same with those stated to you in this discourse. 'Sin', says the Apostle, 'shall not have dominion over you; for you are not under the law, but under grace.' In the 6th and 7th chapters to the Romans, the Apostle taught them that 'they were not under the law'—that 'they were freed from it'—'dead to it'—'delivered from it.' In the 8th chapter, 1st verse, he draws the above conclusion. . . .''[26]

''3d. In the third place, we conclude from the above premises, that there is no necessity for preaching the law in order to prepare men for receiving the gospel.''[27]

''4th. A fourth conclusion which is deducible from the above premises is, that all arguments and motives, drawn from the law or Old Testament, to urge the disciples of Christ to baptize their infants; to observe holy days or religious fasts as preparatory to the observance of the Lord's Supper; to sanctify the seventh day; to enter into national covenants; to establish any form of religion by civil law; and all reasons and motives borrowed from the Jewish law, to excite the disciples of Christ to a compliance with or an imitation of Jewish customs, are inconclusive, repugnant to Christianity ,and fall ineffectual to the ground; not being enjoined or countenanced by the authority of Jesus Christ.''[28]

''5th. In the last place, we are taught from all that has been said, to venerate in the highest degree the Lord Jesus

[25] Young, C. A. *Historical Documents*, 250-254.
[26] *Ibid.*, 253.
[27] *Ibid.*, 263.
[28] *Ibid.*, 279.

Christ; to receive Him as the Great Prophet, of whom Moses in the law, and all the prophets did write. To receive him as the Lord our righteousness, and to pay punctilious regard to all his precepts and ordinances.''[29]

In summary, Campbell maintained that the Christian was not under the law, but under grace, that the old covenant, which was one of circumcision and works, had been abrogated, and consequently was not binding upon Christians, and that when Christ sent out his apostles to preach, he told them to preach the Gospel, and not the law, as a means to conversion.

Even before the sermon had been completed, Pritchard and other hostile ministers saw its drift. They accordingly used every possible means to show their dissatisfaction. When a lady in the audience fainted, Pritchard went to the stand and called out some of the preachers. He also created a disturbance in the congregation. After the commotion had subsided, however, Campbell speedily regained the attention of the audience, which he held to the close. At the intermission, Pritchard called out Elders Estep, Wheeler, and others, and said: ''This will never do. This is not our doctrine. We can not let this pass without a public protest from the Association,''[30] but Estep replied: ''That would create too much excitement, and would injure us

[29] Young, C. A. *Historical Documents*, 279. Campbell had adopted these views of the two covenants as early as 1812 (Gates, Errett. *Early Relation and Separation of Baptists and Disciples*, 28).

[30] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 472.

more than Mr. Campbell. It is better to let it pass and let the people judge for themselves.''[31] The advice of the latter prevailed. False reports, nevertheless, were circulated, and Campbell consequently deemed it advisable to publish his sermon in pamphlet form. This address, everything considered, was perhaps the most widely influential of all that Alexander Campbell ever preached.[32]

The principal differences between the Campbells and the Baptists were:

1. *Baptism.* The Campbells, as previously mentioned, insisted on baptism for the remission of sins upon a confession of faith that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. The Baptists always insisted upon an examination and the relation of a Christian experience before baptism.

2. *Lord's Supper.* The Brush Run Church celebrated the Lord's Supper every Sunday, whereas the Baptist churches celebrated it only monthly or quarterly.

3. *Dispensations.* Baptists regarded all parts of the Bible as equally authoritative and binding. Nevertheless, at the time of his admission to the Red Stone Association, Alexander Campbell held the intolerable heresy (to a Baptist) that the Christians were not under the Old Testament, but the New; not under Moses, but under Christ; not under law, but under grace.

---

[31] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 472.
[32] *Ibid.,* I., 472.

4. *Ordination.* Campbell's views of ordination were very loose to the Baptist way of thinking, and his opinion of an ordained minister's authority was very low. He did not consider ordination essential, and he had exercised the ministerial functions more than a year before he was himself ordained. This offended the Baptists as it had earlier offended the Presbyterians.

5. *Conversion.* The Baptists held to the doctrine of human inability, or the helplessness of the will in conversion. They taught that the irresistible Holy Spirit worked faith in the heart by an act of divine power or regenerating grace. The Campbells taught that faith was the heartfelt belief that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, and grew out of the hearing or receiving of testimony to that fact. They believed that the Holy Spirit played no part in conversion save through the written Word.[33]

In 1817, the year after the delivery of the famous *Sermon on the Law*, Thomas Campbell visited Cambridge, Ohio, and later moved to Kentucky, thus leaving to his son the entire advocacy of the new movement in western Pennsylvania, western Virginia, and eastern Ohio.[34] The following year, the latter issued his first challenge to debate religious differences, but the man challenged, Mr. Finlay, a Union Presbyterian minister, refused. During the same year, Campbell opened Buffalo

[33] Gates, Errett. *Early Relation and Separation of Baptists and Disciples*, 21-25.

[34] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 406.

Seminary in his own home, where he boarded the entrants. In 1819, he met Walter Scott, and the same year his father returned from Kentucky to help in Buffalo Seminary. The elder Campbell also assumed pastoral care of the Brush Run Church.[85]

Even though many of the Baptists were strongly opposed to Alexander Campbell, they recognized his ability, and some of them requested his services in defence of baptism. In 1819, John Birch, a Baptist preacher at Flat Rock, near Mt. Pleasant, Ohio, had baptized a large number of converts. This success led John Walker, a minister of the Secession Church at Mt. Pleasant, to preach sermons in favor of infant baptism. Birch attended on one of these occasions, and at the close questioned some statements made. This led to a challenge by Walker to Birch, or any other Baptist minister of good standing whom he might designate, to debate the question of baptism. Birch picked Alexander Campbell, but the latter hesitated, largely because of deference to his father's opinion, and not through disinclination, for as a boy he had delighted in debating. The following letter to him, the third on the subject, was dated March 27, 1820:

"Dear Brother: I once more undertake to address you by letter; as we are commanded not to weary in well doing, I am disposed to persevere. I am coming this third time unto you. I cannot persuade myself that you will refuse to attend to the dispute with Mr. Walker; therefore I do not feel disposed to complain because you have sent me no

[85] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 406.

answer. True, I have expected an answer signifying your acceptance of the same. I am as yet disappointed, but am not offended nor discouraged. I can truly say that it is the unanimous wish of all the church to which I belong that you should be the disputant. It is Brother Nathaniel Skinner's desire; it is the wish of all the brethren with whom I have conversed that you should be the man. You will, I hope, send me an answer by Brother Jesse Martin, who has promised to bear this unto you. Come, brother; come over into Macedonia and help us.

Yours, in the best of bonds,

John Birch.''[36]

Alexander Campbell debated the question at Mt. Pleasant, Ohio, June 19, 20, 1820; he was so pleased with the outcome that in concluding he gave the following general invitation:

''I this day publish to all present that I feel disposed to meet any Pædobaptist minister of any denomination, of good standing in his party, and I engage to prove in a debate with him, either *vive voce* or with the pen, that infant sprinkling is a human tradition and injurious to the well-being of society religious and political.''[37]

The next year, July, 1821, Adamson Bentley and Sidney Rigdon, two talented Baptist ministers, visited the young debater at his home, spending two days there. They embraced the doctrines of the ''Reformation.''[38] Bentley was a well known and popular minister of the Western Reserve. He had induced a number of preachers to hold yearly what

[36] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 15, 16.
[37] *Ibid.*, II., 29.
[38] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 407.

were called "ministers' meetings" in order to study the Scriptures, to promote their own personal religious advancement, and to help each other by criticizing sermons. Bentley acted as secretary, and aided largely in making the meetings beneficial and interesting. The leaders agreed that the churches should unite to form an association; consequently, on August 30, 1827, the messengers appointed by the churches met and formed the "Mahoning Baptist Association."[39] Bentley and Rigdon gave Campbell pressing invitations to visit the Association and preach for them. Thus a way was opened for "reformation" in the Western Reserve. Campbell said of these two men:

> "On parting the next day, Sidney Rigdon, with all apparent candor, said, if he had within the last year taught and promulgated from the pulpit one error, he had a thousand. At that time he was the great orator of the Mahoning Association, though in authority with the people second always to Adamson Bentley. . . ."[40]

During the early twenties, Alexander Campbell visited Pittsburg occasionally, and, since he was connected with the Red Stone Association, he preached to the Baptist Church there, then numbering over a hundred members. In 1822, through his influence, Sidney Rigdon was persuaded to accept a call as its pastor. The new minister of the Pittsburg Church possessed great fluency of speech and a lively fancy which made him very popular as an

[39] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 43, 44.
[40] *Ibid.*, II., 45.

orator. Since he seemed favorable to the "Reformation," Campbell was anxious to introduce him to Walter Scott, who was still giving weekly lectures on the New Testament to the small church for which Mr. Forrester had preached. Campbell wanted a union between these churches, but both proved rather shy until 1824, for each preferred its own peculiarities.[41]

Because of the growth of the new doctrines, Campbell began to feel the need of a paper in order to direct better and to unify teaching and preaching; hence on July 4, 1823, he published the first number of the *Christian Baptist,* a monthly magazine. The radical tone of this paper increased the opposition of the Baptists. Some of them had been very busy ever since Campbell's *Sermon on the Law,* seven years earlier, in working up a majority against him, so that they could expel him from the association, but the time did not appear propitious until August, 1823.[42] Campbell had been so busy with his duties at Buffalo Seminary that he had not taken time to visit the churches belonging to the association as much as customary. This opportunity had been used by his enemies to good advantage, and charges of heresy were freely circulated against him. Elders Brownfield, Pritchard, and the Stones were making every effort to expel him. They sent special men to all the churches in

[41] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 47, 48, 99.
[42] Gates, Errett. *Early Relation and Separation of Baptists and Disciples,* 35, 36.

the association, and persuaded many to appoint as messengers to the next meeting persons who were opposed to Campbell. The latter knew of these plans, and because he was about to enter into a debate on baptism with a Mr. W. L. MacCalla, a Presbyterian minister of Washington, Kentucky, he thought it best to evade the denominational discredit intended by his enemies, or perhaps stop the discussion altogether. Since he had been frequently urged by Adamson Bentley to leave the Red Stone Association and join the Mahoning, and since several members of the Brush Run Church lived in Wellsburg and vicinity, he decided to form a separate congregation, in which he would place his membership and which could unite with the Mahoning Association. He then told the Brush Run Church that, for special reasons which it was not yet prudent to mention, he wanted letters of dismissal for himself and some thirty other members in order to form a church in Wellsburg. Because of Campbell's unquestioned good judgment the request was at once granted, and the second church of the "Reformation" was immediately formed in Wellsburg.

The old church at Brush Run appointed Thomas Campbell and two others as messengers to Red Stone. Alexander Campbell went as a spectator. When the letter was read, much surprise was expressed because he was not named as a messenger. On the ground of this omission, objection was made to a motion to invite him to a seat. After he had

listened some time in silence, he was asked to state why he was not a messenger from Brush Run. He expressed regret that the association had lost so much time over such trifling matter, and declared that he would relieve them of all further trouble on that score. The reason, he said, was because the church to which he then belonged was not connected with the Red Stone Association. This checkmated his opponents, left him free to carry on his reforms in the association, and allowed him to go to his debate as the undoubted representative of the Baptists.[43] In relating this incident, Campbell said:

"Never did hunters on seeing the game unexpectedly escape from their toils at the moment when its capture was sure, glare upon each other a more mortifying disappointment than that indicated by my pursuers at that instant, on hearing that I was out of their bailiwick, and consequently out of their jurisdiction. A solemn stillness ensued, and, for a time, all parties seemed to have nothing to do."[44]

In 1824, the Wellsburg Church was received into the Mahoning Association, and during the same year Alexander Campbell spent three months in touring Kentucky, where he met John Smith[45]

[43] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 68-70.

[44] *Ibid.*, II., 70.

[45] At Flemingsburg, Kentucky, this eccentric preacher heard Campbell outline the fourth chapter of *Galatians*. After the congregation was dismissed, Smith remarked to a fellow preacher named Vaughn:

"Is it not hard, brother Billy, to ride twenty miles, as I have done, just to hear a man preach thirty minutes?"

"You are mistaken, brother John; look at your watch. It has surely been longer than that," was the reply.

Smith found to his surprise that the discourse had taken up just two hours and a half. Holding up his watch he declared:

and other leading Baptists. The next year he devoted largely to the *Christian Baptist,* in which he began his series, "Restoration of the Ancient Order of Things." In July, 1826, he visited eastern Virginia and met the leading Baptist ministers. They refused to accept his reformatory views, and his standing thus became more precarious. He also made his third visit to Kentucky, this time for his wife's health.[46] The same year, he published the George Campbell, Doddridge, and Macknight translation of the *New Testament,* with notes and additions. This he called *The Living Oracles.* In August, 1826, he attended the Mahoning Association at Lisbon, Ohio, accompanied by Walter Scott, who was elected evangelist of the Association. In January of the next year, Scott visited Campbell at his home, and they studied the Gospel together. In March, Scott began his evangelistic work at Lisbon, Ohio, where he preached baptism for the re-

[46] *Millennial Harbinger,* II., 407, 408. Mrs. Campbell died, October 22, 1827.

"I have never been more deceived. Two hours of my life are gone, I know not how, though wide awake, too, all the time."

Vaughn now referred to Smith's statement that he could tell Campbell's views from one sermon, and asked:

"Did you find out, brother John, whether he was a Calvinist or an Arminian?"

Smith replied:

"No. I know nothing about the man; but, be he saint or devil, he has thrown more light on that Epistle, and on the whole Scriptures than I have received in all the sermons that I have ever heard before."

Campbell and Smith journeyed and talked together, but the latter in spite of his admiration for Campbell was not a blind follower (Williams, J. A. *Life of Elder John Smith,* 131, 132).

mission of sins. The Lisbon Church abandoned the Philadelphia Confession of Faith and became the mother church of the "Reformation" in Ohio.[47]

The spread of the new movement in Ohio is interesting. In 1828, Adamson Bentley went to Braceville, with Jacob Osborne, to hold a meeting. In a sermon he gave the views Campbell had presented in the MacCalla *Debate,* declaring that it was intended as a pledge for the remission of sins. On the way back to Warren, Osborne said, "Well, Brother Bentley, you have christened baptism today." "How so?" was the question. "You termed it a *remitting institution,*" was the reply. Mr. Bentley rejoined, "I do not see how this conclusion is to be avoided with the Scriptures before us." Osborne replied:

> "It is the truth; and I have for some time thought that the waters of baptism must stand in the same position to us that the blood of sacrifices did to the Jews. 'The blood of bulls and of goats could never take away sins,' as Paul declares, yet when offered at the altar by the sinner he had the divine assurance that his sin was forgiven him. This blood was merely typical of the blood of Christ, the true sin offering to which it pointed prospectively, and it seems to me that the water in baptism, which has no power in itself to wash away sins, now refers retrospectively to the purifying power of the blood of the Lamb of God."[48]

A little while after this, Bentley, Osborne, and Scott went down to Howland. When the first two

---

[47] *Millennial Harbinger,* II., 408.

[48] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 207, 208.

mentioned the matter to the latter, he agreed with the views expressed. In one of his sermons at Howland, Osborne again introduced the subject and declared that no one had the promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit until after baptism. Scott seemed surprised, and after the meeting said to Osborne, "You are a man of great courage," and, turning to Bentley, he asked, "Do you not think so, Brother Bentley?" "Why?" was the question. "Because," came the reply, "he ventured to assert to-day that no one had a right to expect the Holy Spirit until after baptism."[49] From that time, Scott studied the order for the various items of the Gospel, and being endowed with fine analytical powers, he placed them thus: faith, repentance, baptism, remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit.[50]

This Scriptural order which Scott had so laboriously evolved relieved at once his previous perplexities, and the Gospel seemed almost like a new revelation to him. He believed that he could now present it in its original simplicity, but still he hesitated for fear of offending the churches which had employed him. About this time he met Joseph Gaston, and told him all. Gaston was delighted, declared that what Scott had said was the truth, and that it ought to be preached to the world. Scott then made an appointment outside of the

[49] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 208.

[50] This order still stands with the Disciples of Christ, although public confession has been inserted just previous to baptism. It may be stated, however, that baptism is itself regarded as a confession of faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God.

association, and with some trembling, but in an interesting manner, presented his views. At the close he gave a formal invitation to come forward and be baptized for the remission of sin. No one moved.[51] This result was not unexpected, for the whole community was filled with the idea that some supernatural revelation had to occur before any one could become a fit subject for baptism. The evangelist, however, had broken through his own fears, and he now gave notice that he would deliver in New Lisbon a course of sermons upon the Ancient Gospel.

A large crowd gathered to hear him. His sermon was based on Peter's confession, *Matthew* 16: 16, in connection with Peter's answer to inquirers on the day of Pentecost, *Acts* 2: 38. The evangelist held the audience in rapt attention while he developed the power of the Christian creed, the rock upon which Christ had announced that he would build His church, and the steps of faith, repentance, baptism, remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit. The people were charmed by this new view of the simplicity and completeness of the Gospel, but as on that earlier occasion, they were filled with doubt and wonder, and asked, "How can these things be?" Just as he was about to close his sermon, a stranger came in and took a seat. When Scott concluded a few minutes later by again quoting Peter's words and inviting any one present to

[51] A similar result had followed Stone's first invitations in Kentucky (Rogers, J. R. *Cane Ridge Meeting House*, 183, 184).

come forward and be baptized for the remission of sins, this stranger at once went forward. Every one was surprised, for the new convert had not been enlightened by the minister, yet he walked with the firmness of an assured purpose. The preacher, too, was astonished, but since, when questioned, the man seemed to understand the matter fully, Scott at once baptized him *"for the remission of sins,"* November 18, 1827. Great excitement ensued, and before the meeting closed seventeen persons accepted primitive baptism. Thereafter these Gospel steps were used with marked success by the Reformers.[63]

Although Scott was pleased with the initial success, he could not help wondering why the stranger, a William Amend, had come forward on a simple invitation, when his first two sermons had failed to convince any one; hence he determined to write a letter of inquiry. Amend answered, declaring that he had been a strict Presbyterian, but that he could not believe all the things taught; consequently he turned to his Bible and studied it for a year. This led him to *John* 3:16, which read: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life." He then went on to inquire how he should believe, and he read such passages as: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," "Faith is the substance

[63] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 210-212.

of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," "Save yourselves," "I must be dead to sin and buried, and raised with Christ Jesus to newness of life," "I must be born again if I would enter the kingdom of God," and "Proclaim the gospel to all nations; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Realizing that Peter had been given the keys, he looked to see what he would do with them. Turning to *Acts* 2:37, 38, he read: "And they were all pricked to the heart, and said to Peter and to the other apostles, 'Men and brethren, what shall we do?' Peter said, 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.'" After remarking that he had often turned to this Scripture and prayed for some one to introduce him, Amend said:

"Now, my brother, I will answer your questions. I was baptized on the 18th of November, 1827, and will relate to you a circumstance which occurred a few days before that date. I had read the second chapter of Acts, when I expressed myself to my wife as follows: 'Oh this is the gospel; this is the thing we wish—the remission of our sins! Oh that I could hear the gospel in these same words as Peter preached it! I hope I shall some day hear it, and the first man I meet who will preach the gospel thus, with him will I go. So, my brother, on the day you saw me come into the meeting-house my heart was open to receive the word of God, and when you cried, 'The Scripture shall no longer be a sealed book. God means what he says. Is there any man present who will take God at his word and be baptized for the remission of sins?'—at that moment my feelings were such that I could have cried out, 'Glory to God! I have found the man whom I have long sought for.' So I

entered the kingdom when I readily laid hold of the hope set before me.''[53]

Concerning the plea thus advocated by Scott, Hayden wrote:

''It is true the *Christian Baptist,* in the first volume, had taught the scriptural connection between baptism and remission, in an essay by the elder Campbell; also in A. Campbell's Debate with Mr. McCalla the same truth was distinctly set forth. But it remained among the theories. Sinners still languished in despairing doubt, awaiting some light, emotion or sensation on which they might settle as the 'white stone' of elective grace, specially imparted to assure them they were of the elect for whom Christ died. Besides, all the prominent creeds of Christendom contain the doctrine of baptism as a pledge of remission, as an item of dogmatic belief. But not one of the sects built upon them carries out its creed, in this particular, into practical result, and tells the awakened sinner, as did Peter on the first Pentecost after the ascension: 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.''[54]

Scott sailed with his plea through the Western Reserve like a meteor. Exaggerated reports of his doings reached the Campbells, and they, fearing his haste, decided that Thomas Campbell should visit the Western Reserve and see for himself. The visitor was delighted, and joined Scott for a while in his theory reduced to practice. On April 9, 1828, he wrote from New Lisbon to his son:

---

[53] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 213, 214.
[54] *Early History of Disciples in Western Reserve,* 80, 81.

"I perceive that theory and practice in religion, as well as in other things, are matters of distinct consideration. . . . We have spoken and published many things *correctly* concerning the ancient gospel, its simplicity and perfect adaptation to the present state of mankind, for the benign and gracious purposes of its immediate relief and complete salvation; but I must confess that, in respect of the direct exhibition and application of it, for that blessed purpose, I am at present, for the first time, upon the ground where the thing has appeared to be practically exhibited to the proper purpose. 'Compel them to come in,' saith the Lord, 'that my house may be filled.'

"Mr. Scott has made a bold push to accomplish this object, by simply and boldly stating the ancient gospel and insisting upon it; and then by putting the question generally and particularly to males and females, old and young. Will you come to Christ and be baptized for the remission of your sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit? Don't you believe this blessed gospel? Then come away, etc, etc. This elicits a personal conversation; some confess faith in the testimony—beg time to think; others consent—give their hands to be baptized as soon as convenient; others debate the matter friendly; some go straight to the water, be it day or night; and, upon the whole, none appear offended."[55]

About the time Scott and the Reformers adopted the plea mentioned above, James Hughes, Lewis Harnwick, Lewis, Conner, and John Secrest, all Kentucky followers of Barton W. Stone, went through Belmont and Columbiana counties, converting many and planting churches. They repudiated all creeds, contended for the Bible alone, and favored the name "Christian." Since they were full of zeal and gifted in exhortation, they

[55] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 219, 220.

won many converts. They used the "mourning-bench system," and completed the process of conversion and reception by extending publicly to the convert the "right hand of fellowship," after which he was regarded as a member of the church. From this wing of the "Reformation" came such men as John Whitacre, William Schooley, John Fleck, and Joseph Gaston, all noted preachers. They examined and accepted the Gospel plea as advocated by Scott, and thereafter spent their lives in its defence. Minister after minister adopted it, and thus it was soon carried all over the West of that day.[56]

During the same year, 1828, Alexander Campbell issued his second edition of *The Living Oracles,* accepted Robert Owen's challenge to debate the claims of infidelity as opposed to religion, published a hymn book, and married Miss Selma H. Bakewell, of Wellsburg. In addition to keeping up the *Christian Baptist,* and all his religious work, he continued his farming. According to reports, he was the first man to import Merino and Saxony sheep over the Allegheny mountains. Next year, April 13-22, 1829, he debated with Owen in the Methodist church at Cincinnati, Ohio,[57] and planned to discontinue the publication of the *Christian Baptist,* for he feared that the term "Christian-Baptist" would be applied to the advocates of reform, and he realized that the time had come for constructive work rather than destructive. The principles of

[56] Hayden, A. S. *Disciples in Western Reserve,* 80, 81.
[57] See pages 265-270.

the "Reformation" were spreading rapidly; many even in England and Ireland favored and accepted the new teaching.[58]

A few months after the debate with Owen, in August, 1829, Campbell was elected to and in October attended the Constitutional Convention of Virginia. Representation in that state was based in part upon slaves, and since these were held largely in the eastern section, the white population of the West, although nearly equal in number to that of the East, found itself under the control of a majority, which many thought legislated too exclusively for the interest of its own section. Influenced by the remonstrances of the western members, or fearful that the rapidly growing white population of the West would soon wrest political power from the East, the Legislature of 1827 and 1828, in spite of the opposition in the Tidewater district, passed an act to take the sense of the voters on calling a convention. A majority, 21,898 to 16,646, favored this action. The most eminent men of the country were chosen as delegates.[59] Four were to be selected from the district in which Campbell lived. Philip Doddridge, of Wellsburg, was the most distinguished politician in the West, and he was at once nominated. At that time Campbell had been before the public only as an educator and minister, but now the request came that he let himself be nomi-

[58] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 408.

[59] Ambler, C. H. *Sectionalism in Virginia from 1776 to 1861*, 137-144.

nated as a delegate. Many of his religious opponents urged him strongly to this course, for they had confidence in his ability. He refused at first, but his political friends urged that it was not a canvass for an office of emolument, but an important occasion to the state of which he was a citizen, for the organic law of that state was to be amended and the control of the eastern and slave-holding element resisted. His religious friends declared, moreover, that the office was higher than the ordinary plane of politics, that it would not compromise him in any way as a religious teacher, but that it would give him greater influence by placing him in contact with the most influential persons in the state. Campbell at length yielded to this urging, with the express stipulation that he would not have to take part in the canvass personally, and with the understanding that Doddridge would gladly accept him as a colleague. As soon as the canvass commenced, however, Samuel Sprigg, a noted lawyer of Wheeling, and a warm personal friend of Doddridge, announced himself as an opposition candidate to Campbell. When the latter discovered this faithlessness, he yielded to the representations of his friends and perhaps to his rising Irish temper, and took an active part in the canvass.

Accordingly, Campbell made it a point to be present at one of the most doubtful and important precincts in Monongalia county, where Mr. Sprigg was to address the voters at the polls. Sprigg, in his speech, attacked the members of the ministerial

profession as unfit to act as delegates to a constitutional convention, and urged the importance of sending delegates whose lives had been spent in investigating and applying principles of civil government and constitutional law. He talked long also on the subject of representation, and declared that basing the representation wholly on the white population was the only fair way to the western section of the state. Since he took up so much time, little was left to Campbell before the opening of the polls. The latter, realizing that the people were weary, said in beginning that he could not think of detaining them much longer. He then briefly refuted the arguments used by his opponent against the competence of ministers and in favor of the supposed claims of lawyers, expressed himself in favor of representation based entirely on the white population, and denounced the evils of the existing system where the political power depended upon the number of persons held in bondage. Since the crowd was composed largely of farmers, Campbell extolled the virtues of agriculturists, and declared that he had been a practical farmer for years.[60] He concluded:

"'Tis the interest of the farmer that should be consulted. It is his welfare especially that should be promoted, since it is the farmer who has to bear at last the burdens of the government. . . . Allow me to illustrate this by what I noticed when a lad on a visit to the city of Belfast. In viewing the city, I recollect that my attention was par-

[60] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 304-308.

ticularly engaged by a large sign over one of its extensive stores. This sign contained four large painted figures. The first was a picture of the king in his royal robes, with the crown upon his head, and the legend issuing from his mouth, 'I reign for all.' Next to him was the figure of a bishop, in gown and surplice, with the inscription, 'I pray for all.' The third was a soldier in his regimentals standing by a cannon and uttering the words, 'I fight for all.' But the fourth figure, gentlemen, was the most noteworthy and important of all in this pictorial representation of the different parts of human society. It represented a farmer, amidst the utensils of his calling, standing by his plow, and exclaiming, 'I pay for all.'"[61]

After the cheering had subsided, the polls were opened. The law then required each voter to announce publicly the name of his candidate so that his vote could be recorded. For some time nothing was heard but the name "Campbell." It began to look as if the choice might be unanimous, but at last the name of "Sprigg" was mentioned, whereupon that individual arose and pleasantly remarked, with a bow: "I thank the gentleman for his vote, for I was really beginning to think you had all forgotten that I am a candidate."[62] When the votes of the different counties—Ohio, Tyler, Brooke, Monongalia and Preston—were counted, it was found that Alexander Campbell and Philip Doddridge, together with Charles D. Morgan and Eugenius M. Wilson of Monongalia, had been elected.

The convention, composed in all of ninety-six delegates, met at Richmond, October 5, 1829.

[61] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 309.
[62] *Ibid.*, II., 309.

Among its members were James Madison, James Monroe, Chief-Justice Marshall, John Randolph of Roanoke, Judge Upshur, Benjamin W. Leigh, and Philip S. Barbour. After the preliminary arrangements had been made, the clash of interests came into view. Waiting until Doddridge and several others had spoken, Campbell delivered an able speech against apportioning representation in the House of Delegates according to white population and taxation combined, as the East so strongly desired. Judge Upshur, representing eastern interests, had made able speeches, October 27 and 28, 1829. Since these are somewhat foreign in interest to the main theme, full consideration can not be given, but the Judge had declared in partial summary, October 28, 1829:

"I have thus endeavored to prove, Mr. Chairman, that whether it be right as a general principle or not, that property should possess an influence in Government, it is certainly right as to us. It is right because *our* property, so far as slaves are concerned, is *peculiar;* because it is of imposing magnitude; because it affords almost a full half of the productive labor of the State; because it is exposed to peculiar impositions, and therefore to peculiar hazards; and because it is the interest of the whole Commonwealth, that its power should not be taken away. I admit that we have no danger to apprehend, except from oppressive and unequal taxation; no other injustice can reasonably be feared. It is impossible that any free Government, can establish an open and palpable inequality of rights. Resistance would be the necessary consequence; and thus the evil would soon cure itself. But the power of taxation often works insidi-

ously. The very victim who feels its oppression, may be ignorant of the source from which it springs.''[63]

He concluded: ". . . For more than half a century, the political power of this Commonwealth has been in the hands which now hold it. During all that time, it has not been abused. Is it then without cause that I ask for a good reason why it should now be taken away?''[64]

Campbell attempted to establish four points in his first important speech, October 31:

1. That apportionment of representation according to white population and taxation combined rested upon unphilosophical and anti-republican views of society.

2. That such representation was the common ground of aristocratical and monarchical governments.

3. That most of the free holders of Virginia were opposed to such an apportionment.

4. That the white population basis would favor the whole state.[65]

Owing to the importance of that address, rather extensive quotations will be given:

''But, Sir, it is not the increase of population in the west which this gentleman ought to fear. It is the energy which the mountain breeze and western habits impart to

[63] Virginia State Convention. *Debates and Proceedings*, 1829, 1830, 75.

[64] *Ibid.*, 79.

[65] *Ibid.*, 118.

these emigrants. They are regenerated; politically, I mean, Sir. They become *working politicians;* and the difference, Sir, between a *talking* and a *working* politician, is immense. The Old Dominion has long been celebrated for producing great orators; the ablest metaphysicians in policy; men that can split hairs in all abstruse questions of political economy. But at home, or when they return from Congress, they have negroes to fan them asleep. But a Pennsylvania, a New York, a Ohio, or a western Virginia statesman, has this advantage, that when he returns home, he takes off his coat, and takes hold of the plough. This gives him bone and muscle, Sir, and preserves his Republican principles pure and uncontaminated. . . .

"This gentleman (Judge Upshur) starts with the postulate, that there are two sorts of majorities of numbers and interests; in plain English, of men and money. I do not well understand, why he ought not to have added, also, majorities of talent, physical strength, scientific skill, and general literature. These are all more valuable than money, and as useful to the State. A Robert Fulton, a General Jackson, a Joseph Lancaster, a Benjamin Franklin, are as useful to the State, as a whole district of mere slave-holders. Now, all the logic, metaphysics and rhetoric of this Assembly, must be put to requisition to shew, why a citizen, having a hundred negroes, should have ten times more political power than a Joseph Lancaster, or a Robert Fulton, with only a house and garden. And if scientific skill, physical strength military powers, or general literature, in some individuals, is entitled to so much respect, why ought not those majorities in a community to have as much weight as mere wealth."[66]

Campbell believed, as an examination of this speech shows, that man possessed the right of suffrage prior to his entrance into the social com-

[66] Virginia State Convention. *Debates and Proceedings,* 1829, 1830, 119.

pact, that society might divest him of it, but could not confer it, for it was a right "natural" and "underived." He was ridiculed with regard to his state of nature and his argument on majorities. He answered thus:

". . . . The gentlemen on the other side, have triumphantly called upon us, to find the origin of majorities in the state of nature. Nay, indeed, they almost ridicule the idea of men existing in a state of nature. We all know, that men roaming at large, over the forests could have no idea of majorities; it is not applicable to them. But, so soon as men form a social compact, it is one of the first things, which, from nature itself, would present itself to them. The true origin of this idea, is found in the nature and circumstances of men. Man is a social animal, and in obedience to this law of his nature, he seeks society, and desires the countenance of men. But, as all men are not born on the same day, and do not all place their eyes upon the same object, at the same time, nor receive the same education, they cannot all be of the same opinion. Some arrangement, founded on the nature of man, for men's living to-gether, must then be adopted. And the impossibility of gratifying their social desires, but in yielding to differences of opinion, presents itself among the very first reflections. In all matters, then, of common interest, when a difference occurs, one party must yield. . . . All nature cries, the inferior to the superior; the weaker to the stronger; the less to the greater. It is, then, founded on the nature of things. And a moment's reflection will convince us, that, in case of a struggle, the minority must yield to the majority; for, they have the power, either to compel it, or to expel the disaffected. It is, then, as natural a conclusion and arrangement, as can be conceived."[67]

[67] Virginia State Convention. *Debates and Proceedings,* 1829, 1830, 120, 121.

During the convention, Campbell made several speeches in an effort to secure for the West the changes[68] that were demanded, but the eastern majority proved determined to retain the provisions to which the West objected. Consequently, the constitution, which was submitted to the Convention, January 14, 1830, retaining the provisions to which the West was opposed, received a majority of fourteen votes. As Campbell had foreseen, it proved entirely unsatisfactory to the people of the West. When the vote was taken in Brooke County, he was present and at the request of the citizens gave a brief explanation of the principles of the proposed constitution, and expressed the hope that it would be rejected because of its anti-republican

[68] In 1828, the House of Delegates had 214 members; the Senate, 24. Of this number the transmontane country with a total white population of 254,196 had only 80 delegates and 9 senators, while the cismontane country with a white population of 348,873 had 134 delegates and 15 senators. An apportionment on the basis of white population would have changed the Senate little, but would have given the West 90 delegates. The East, too, had grievances. In 1829 the West drew annually from the treasury far more than it contributed. Taxes were paid on a valuation of 1817, when the East was more prosperous. In 1829, the average valuation upon which each section paid taxes was per acre: Trans-Allegheny—92 cents; Valley—$7.33; Piedmont—$8.20; Tidewater—$8.43. P. W. Leigh estimated that the East paid $3.24 in taxes for every dollar paid by the West. There were then east of the Blue Ridge 397,000 negro slaves subject to taxation, and only 50,000 in the West. The slave property contributed almost one third of the entire state revenue (See Ambler, C. H. *Sectionalism in Virginia*, 137-141). These points were thoroughly debated in Convention. Doddridge, Campbell, and other western leaders admitted them, but pointed to the growth of population as an equalizer and to the services of the western soldiers in the war of 1812 (*Debates*, 123).

The writer hopes at some future time to make a more detailed study of Alexander Campbell in the Virginia Constitutional Convention.

principles. This short speech proved very effective. After the vote had been taken, it was found that Brooke County had favored rejection by a vote of 370 to 0. Brooke was the only county in the state where rejection was unanimous, but other counties came near this, as Logan, where the vote was 255 to 2, and Ohio, 643 to 3 against ratification. The state-wide vote, however, stood 26,055 to 15,563 in favor of the constitution.[69]

As indicated earlier, Campbell avoided politics as much as possible, although he did hold the office of postmaster for some time; hence, if possible, his motives in serving in the constitutional convention should be ascertained. On reaching home, February 1, 1830, after having been absent since September 22, 1829, he found many letters awaiting him, one being from William Tener of Londonderry. In answer to this, he gave the motives which had influ-

---

[69] Perhaps it will not be entirely out of place to observe in a foot note that Gordon's plan of compromise allowed conservatives to retain control. Efforts in the convention to extend the franchise to all tax payers had been defeated 44 to 48. Suffrage was extended somewhat, nevertheless, by taking in lease holders and house-keepers, but the number of men of legal age remaining disqualified was over 30,000. Doddridge's motion to elect the governor by a popular vote was a tie, and was decided in the negative. By the constitution, central executive authority, somewhat increased, was vested in a governor elected for three years by joint ballot of the Assembly. The executive council was retained, though reduced in membership.

The differences between the East and the West were not settled by this constitution. They were merely transferred from the counties of northern Piedmont and the Shenandoah Valley to the trans-Allegheny. Thereafter, sectionalism, according to Ambler, was a contest between the districts now known as Virginia and West Virginia (see his *Sectionalism*, 137-174, for a good account of the whole struggle).

enced him to become a candidate for the convention. He wrote:

"But you may ask, What business had I in such matters? I will tell you. I have no taste or longings for political matters or honors, but as this was one of the most grave and solemn of all political matters, and not like the ordinary affairs of legislation, and therefore not incompatible with the most perfect gravity and self-respect, I consented to be elected, and especially because I was desirous of laying a foundation for the abolition of slavery (in which, however, I was not successful), and of gaining an influence in public estimation to give currency to my writings, and to put down some calumnies afar off that I was not in good standing in my own State."[70]

In this latter object, that of gaining higher influence in the public estimation, Campbell was certainly successful. While at Richmond, in private conversation and in the social circle, he pressed the views of the "Reformation." Every Lord's Day he spoke to large audiences on the primitive Gospel, and many of the convention members attended. Upon these he made a very favorable impression. On the way home, Ex-President Madison spent the first night with a relative, Edmund Pendleton, of Louisa. The latter was slightly inclined to the principles of the "Restoration;" hence he inquired Madison's opinion of Campbell. After speaking in high terms of the ability shown in the convention, the former president added: "But it is as a theologian that Mr. Campbell must be known. It was

[70] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 319, 320.

my pleasure to hear him very often as a preacher of the gospel, and I regard him as the ablest and most original expounder of the Scriptures I have ever heard.''[71]

After Campbell returned from the convention he visited Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee, and took up his editorial work with renewed zeal. The *Millennial Harbinger,*[72] the first number of which came out January 1, 1830, was devoted to the plea for the restoration of primitive Christianity. This plea, however, stirred the Baptists to intense opposition. Antagonism had been growing from the time of the *Sermon on the Law,* 1816, and especially from the period when Walter Scott began to preach the Gospel steps plea, 1827. Exclusions and divisions were not infrequent in the late twenties. In the spring of 1830, the Third Baptist Church of Philadelphia excluded a number, who at once formed an independent church and adopted the ancient order of things as taught by the Campbells and Scott. In Kentucky and in certain parts of Virginia, however, where the principles of the ''Reformation'' had been most widely scattered, the greatest troubles took place. No one will contend that the Reformers were blameless. Some excited prejudice unnecessarily by crying out against church covenants, creeds, etc., ''to the legitimate use of which Mr. Campbell never had objected.''[73] Ignorant

[71] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 313.
[72] Successor to the *Christian Baptist.*
[73] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 322.

persons gave just offence by bigoted and crude assertions, and not a few had the conceit of superior knowledge and an overbearing disposition. On the whole, nevertheless, the Reformers were forbearing and endured with some patience the misrepresentation of their opponents.

Since the conditions seethed thus, only a slight impulse was necessary to start a flame. It came from an unexpected quarter. Two or three fragments of churches on the Western Reserve, as at Youngstown, Palmyra, and Salem, which had refused to enter the "Reformation," had joined a small association on Beaver Creek. Aided by a Mr. Winter and one or two other ministers intensely opposed to Campbell, they persuaded the association to publish a circular anathematizing the Mahoning Association and Mr. Campbell as "disbelieving and denying many of the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures."[74] These charges, as given by Gates, follow:

"1. They, the Reformers, maintain that there is no promise of salvation, without baptism.

"2. That baptism should be administered to all who say they believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, without examination on any other point.

"3. That there is no direct operation of the Holy Spirit on the mind prior to baptism.

"4. That baptism procures the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

---

[74] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 322.

"5. That the Scriptures are the only evidence of interest in Christ.

"6. That obedience places it in God's power to elect to salvation.

"7. That no creed is necessary for the church but the Scriptures as they stand, And

"8. That all baptized persons have the right to administer the ordinance of baptism."[75]

This circular letter immediately gained great popularity, and was widely copied by Baptist papers and associations. Thus, Dover, Virginia, decreed non-fellowship with the Reformers and Dover Association followed, December, 1830.[76] Franklin Association, Kentucky, and Appomattox Association, Virginia, denounced Campbell's writings and all persons holding the views expressed in the Beaver circular.[77] Partly because of these attacks, Mahoning and Stillwater Associations, Ohio, dissolved as associations and resolved to meet as annual meetings without any authority. The Reformers now began to organize churches distinct from the Baptists, and this step marks the existence of the Disciples of Christ as a separate church.[78] Campbell, unable to allay the storm, described the Beaver anathema as "a tissue of falsehoods," and attacked, possibly with justice, the character of Winter, one of its chief promoters. He showed his

[75] *Early Relation and Separation of Baptists and Disciples*, 92.

[76] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 409.

[77] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 323.

[78] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 409, also Newman, A. H. *A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*, 494.

dislike of separation, but also his willingness to abide the result by asking:

"Who is making divisions and schisms? Who is rending the peace of the churches? Who are creating factions, swellings and tumults? We who are willing to bear and forbear, or they who are anathematizing and attempting to excommunicate? Let the umpires decide the question. For my own part, I am morally certain they who oppose us are unable to meet us on the Bible; they are unable to meet us before the public; and this I say, not as respects their talents, acquirements or general abilities, but as respects their systems. Thousands are convinced of this, and they might as well bark at the moon as to oppose us by bulls and anathemas. If there be a division, gentlemen, you will make it, not I; and the more you oppose us with the weight of your censure, like a palm tree we will grow the faster. I am for peace, for union, for harmony, for co-operation with all good men. But I fear you not; if you will fling firebrands, arrows and discords into the army of the faith, you will repent it, not we. You will lose influence, not we. We covet not persecution, but we disregard it. We fear nothing but error, and should you proceed to make divisions, you will find that they will reach much farther than you are aware, and that the time is past when an anathema from an association will produce any other effect than contempt from some and a smile from others."[79]

That Campbell was correct in the extent of the divisions is apparent from the following quotations. The Dover Association report read in part: "The system of religion known by the name of Campbellism has spread of late among our churches to a distressing extent and seems to call loudly for

[79] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 323-324.

remedial measures."[80] The New York *Baptist Register* of 1830 said:

"Mr. Campbell's paper and their vigorous missionary efforts are making great achievements. It is said that one half of the Baptist churches in Ohio have embraced this sentiment and become what they call Christian Baptists. It is spreading like a mighty contagion through the Western States, wasting Zion in its progress. In Kentucky its desolations are said to be even greater than in Ohio."[81]

The following bitter lamentation came from a Mr. McConnico of Tennessee:

"My beloved brethren:—Campbellism has carried away many whom I thought firm. These wandering stars and clouds without water ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth, make proselytes much more the children of the devil than they were before. O Lord! hear the cries and see the tears of the Baptists; for Alexander hath done them much harm. The Lord reward him according to his works. Look at the Creaths of Kentucky. Look at Anderson, Craig, and Hopwood of Tennessee. See them dividing churches and spreading discord, and constituting churches out of excommunicated members. Such shuffling—such slandering—such evil speaking—such dissembling—such downright hypocrisy—and all under the false name of reformation."[82]

A. H. Newman, the Baptist historian, although admitting the divisions, took a broader, more philosophical, and a more hopeful view of the situation. He said:

---

[80] Gates, Errett. *Early Relation and Separation of Baptists and Disciples*, 73.

[81] *Ibid.*, 73.

[82] *Ibid.*, 100.

"The growth of the 'Disciples' party was very rapid, and a large number of Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists were won to its support. Baptists soon recovered measurably from the shock and have steadily advanced in the regions covered by the activity of the Disciples. It is probable that the cause of antipedobaptism and of immersion gained largely from the schism. That it may speedily come to an end with no sacrifice of truth should be the earnest prayer of Baptists and Disciples alike." [83]

Of course, many of those who had favored the new movement now deserted it, but others took their place. Jacob Creath, Sr., whom Clay had pronounced the finest natural orator he ever heard, had been somewhat cautious in defining his position. He now came forward openly. To his surprise, however, he met Jeremiah Vardeman, a noted Reformer, going back. "Hey, Jerry," said he, "what's the matter?" "Oh," was the answer, "if this thing takes, we shall all starve. The Baptists are not too liberal as it is." [84] The lessened contributions of the churches, growing out of their unsettled condition and attributed to the new teachings had been used as an argument to retain a Reformer in sentiment, and a man who had done much to further the "Reformation." Vardeman, as is usual in such cases, thought it necessary to show his renewed zeal to the Baptist cause by extreme measures; hence through his influence an effort was made to excommunicate Versailles, Providence, and South Elkhorn, without examination or committees

[83] *A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*, 494.
[84] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 324.

of inquiry, with the intention of cutting off the Creaths, Josephus Hewitt, and a few other prominent men who had urged the primitive faith and order as taught by the Reformers. In defence of the rights of the churches, Jacob Creath, Sr. delivered a speech which Thomas Campbell and other competent judges present considered as almost unequaled in eloquence and power. Arguments were of no avail, however, for forty-two out of seventy-one had resolved on exclusion; consequently exclusion was carried. Almost immediately after this action, Vardeman moved to Missouri, where he died a few years later without retaining much of his former popularity. In spite of his apostasy, nevertheless, Alexander Campbell always regarded him with affectionate feeling, and often remarked: "I knew him well, and if I had been in Kentucky at the time, Jeremiah Vardeman would never have been persuaded to abandon the cause of the Reformation."[85] Though the Disciples lost many leaders such as Vardeman, they gained new ones. Jacob Creath, Sr., William Morton, John Smith, and Jacob Creath, Jr., devoted themselves with zeal to the Gospel message of the Reformers and organized many churches, most of which, especially in the towns, adopted weekly communion, while some in the country celebrated the Lord's Supper monthly, as the Baptists had done, for they could secure a minister only about once a month.[86]

[85] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 325, 326.
[86] *Ibid.*, II., 326.

In concluding this chapter it seems advisable to consider a few reasons for the success met in launching the new church. One of the strongest of these was that the movement of the Campbells was an outgrowth of conditions then existing. It represented the "time spirit." In the words of H. V. Kirk: "He [Alexander Campbell] also represented the time spirit (zeit geist) of the American Republic. He came in line with the great social and political movements of his day. He was the voice of democracy, of individualism in the religious sphere."[87] Errett Gates listed the general causes of success as follows:

1. Conditions favorable among the Baptists.
2. General religious conditions favorable to progress.
3. Conditions favorable to success present in the movement itself.

Under the first head, the following conditions proved propitious:

1. Division among the Baptists into "Regulars" and "Separates."
2. Hyper-Calvinism in many sections.
3. Close attachment to creeds.
4. The anti-missionary spirit which then prevailed among the Baptists.

In the second place, this was a period of general religious unrest—the growth of Universalism and Unitarianism. The earlier religious movements

[87] *A History of the Theology of the Disciples of Christ*, 50, 51.

have already been considered—secessions from the Methodist Church of Virginia and North Carolina led by James O'Kelly, from the Baptists in Vermont led by Abner Jones, and from the Presbyterians of Kentucky led by Barton W. Stone. These bodies were alike in their opposition to creeds and sectarian names, and their insistence on the name "Christian." They discovered each other and formed the so-called "Christian Church" which still survives under the name "Christian Connection," though perhaps the majority united with the followers of Alexander Campbell as will be detailed later. In 1830, the Church of God came into existence on much the same principles.

In the third place, as has already been indicated and as will be made plain by more detail later on, the "Reformation" movement was supplied with excellent leaders, the plan of salvation was democratic and popular, and the message—the union of all Christians by the restoration of apostolic Christianity based on the Bible alone—appealed to the worried and thoughtful of all creeds.[88]

---

[88] Gates, E. *Early Relation and Separation of Baptists and Disciples*, 76-87.

VI

UNION—OPPOSITION—CAUSES THEREFOR

BY 1830, a new period had dawned in the movement for the union of all Christians by the restoration of primitive Christianity. The Baptists, as indicated in the previous chapter, had refused their organization for the purposes of the Reformers; consequently the latter were forced into a separate existence. Thus, by 1832, in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and other states, the Reforming element to the number of twenty or thirty thousand had been practically eliminated from the Baptist churches. A twofold result was at once apparent: the ministers of the "Restoration" had to organize new churches, if their converts were to enjoy Christian fellowship; and the Baptist churches no longer received the fruits of the expelled clergy.[1] The separation also gave an impetus to the union with Stone's followers in Kentucky. The possibility of

[1] Gates, E. *The Disciples of Christ*, 177-179. The terms "Restoration" and "Reformation" were frequently applied to the movement discussed in this book. The leaders wanted to restore Christianity to what they called its primitive purity. In order to do this, they taught that certain reforms in doctrine and practice were necessary; hence the movement was called the "Reformation," and those who took part in it, "Reformers." The last two terms have been frequently used in this book.

such a union had been foreseen by a few, since Alexander Campbell's first visit to Kentucky in 1823. Concerning that visit, the excitement caused thereby, and his own opinion of Campbell and their petty differences, Stone wrote:

"Some said, 'He is a good man,' but others said, 'Nay, for he deceiveth the people.' When he came into Kentucky, I heard him often in public and in private. I was pleased with his manner and matter. I saw no distinctive feature between the doctrine he preached and that which we had preached for many years, except on baptism for remission of sins. Even this I had once received and taught, as before stated, but had strangely let go from my mind, till Brother Campbell revived it afresh. I thought then that he was not sufficiently explicit on the influences of the Spirit, which led many honest Christians to think he denied them. Had he been as explicit then, as since, many honest souls would have been still with us, and would have greatly aided the good cause. In a few things I dissented from him, but was agreed to disagree. [2]

"I will not say there are no faults in Brother Campbell; but there are fewer, perhaps, in him than any man I know on earth; and over these few my love would throw a veil, and hide them from view forever. I am constrained, and willingly constrained, to acknowledge him the greatest promoter of this Reformation of any man living. The Lord reward him." [3]

Since the differences were so few, a meeting was held at Lexington, Kentucky, on New Year's Day,

[2] The Reformers, for instance, insisted on weekly communion, which Stone's followers had neglected (Rogers, J. R. *The Cane Ridge Meeting House, Autobiography*, 202).

[3] Rogers, J. R. *The Cane Ridge Meeting House, Autobiography*, 200, 201.

1832, to effect a union. John Smith and Barton W. Stone were the principal speakers. The former, representing the Reformers, declared:

"God has but one people on the earth. He has given to them but one Book, and therein exhorts and commands them to be one family. A union, such as we plead for—a union of God's people on that one Book—must, then, be practicable.

"Every Christian desires to stand complete in the whole will of God. The prayer of the Savior, and the whole tenor of his teaching, clearly show that it is God's will that his children should be united. To the Christians, then, such a union must be desirable. . . .

"While there is but one faith, there may be ten thousand opinions; and hence, if Christians are ever to be one, they must be one in faith, and not in opinion. . . .

"For several years past, I have stood pledged to meet the religious world, or any part of it, on the ancient Gospel and order of things, as presented in the words of the Book. This is the foundation on which Christians once stood, and on it they can, and ought to, stand again. From this I can not depart to meet any man, or set of men, in the wide world. While, for the sake of peace and Christian union, I have long since waived the public maintenance of any speculation I may hold, *yet not one Gospel fact, commandment, or promise, will I surrender for the world!*

"Let us, then, my brethren, be no longer Campbellites or Stoneites, New Lights or Old Lights, or any other kind of *lights*, but let us all come to the Bible, and to the Bible alone, as the only book in the world that can give us all the Light we need."[4]

Barton W. Stone then rose to reply. He spoke in much the same vein. After declaring his opposi-

[4] Williams, J. A. *Life of Elder John Smith*, 371, 372.

tion to speculations and man-made creeds, he said: "I have not one objection to the ground laid down by him as the true scriptural basis of union among the people of God; and I am willing to give him, now and here, my hand."[5] Smith grasped the proffered hand, and the union was virtually, though not formally, completed.[6] Various committees met, and by arrangement the members of both churches communed together, February 19. They agreed to finish the formal and public union on the following Lord's Day, February 26. In the meantime, however, some began to fear that they had been too hasty, and to worry about the choice of elders and the practical adoption of weekly communion, which they believed would require the presence of an ordained administrator. While affairs were thus in suspense, Thomas M. Allen went to Lexington and induced them to complete the union and to transfer to the new congregation, designated as "the Church of Christ," the comfortable building which they had formerly held under the title of "the Christian Church." This was especially pleasing to the Reformers, who had been meeting in rented houses. At Paris, Allen also effected a union between two churches, he and James Challen, the ministers there, retiring in favor of Aylett Raines, a gifted preacher of the Western Reserve, who rendered excellent

[5] Williams, J. A. *Life of Elder John Smith*, 373.

[6] The union led to increased persecutions, for the Baptists were even less favorable to the "Christians" than they had been to the Reformers.

service in Kentucky for over twenty years. Another union was brought about at Georgetown.

Union in the three places mentioned above—Lexington, Paris, and Georgetown—soon led to union throughout the state. This desire for unity was greatly furthered by the efforts of John Smith and John Rogers, the first formerly known as a "Reformer," and the latter as a "Christian," who had been appointed by the Lexington meeting to go to all the churches and convince them of their sincerity. These special messengers were to be equally supported by the united offerings of the interested churches, which were to leave their contributions with John T. Johnson, as treasurer and distributor.[7] About 8000 "Christians" came into the union in Kentucky. Aside from their leaders mentioned earlier, who had prepared the way or furthered the movement of the Campbells, John Allen Gano, F. R. Palmer, H. D. Palmer, B. F. Hall, Tolbert Fanning, Elijah Goodwin, and Samuel Rogers were important. The latter traveled in Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri, and during a ministry which lasted past the eighty-fourth year of his life baptized over 7000 persons.[8] Writers of the Christian Connection try to explain Stone's attitude on the union as only one of co-operation.[9] This is an impossible position, however, for Stone defended

[7] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 383-385.

[8] Gates, E. *The Disciples of Christ,* 204-208.

[9] Some of these writers are: J. F. Burnett, J. J. Summerbell, O. B. Whitaker, and M. T. Morrill.

it as a union and distinctly stated: "This union I view as the noblest act of my life."[10] The union movement was more successful in Kentucky than elsewhere. Concerning the drawbacks in other places, Stone wrote:

"This union, I have no doubt, would have been as easily effected in other States as in Kentucky, had there not been a few ignorant, headstrong bigots on both sides, who were more influenced to retain and augment their party, than to save the world by uniting according to the prayer of Jesus. Some irresponsible zealots among the Reformers, so called, would publicly and zealously contend against sinners praying, or that professors should pray for them; they spurned the idea that preachers should pray that God would assist them in declaring his truth to the people; they rejected from Christianity all who were not baptized for the remission of sins, and who did not observe the weekly communion, and many such doctrines they preached. The old Christians, who were unacquainted with the preachers of information amongst us, would naturally conclude these to be the doctrines of us all; and they rose up in opposition to us all, representing our religion as a spiritless, prayerless religion, and dangerous to the souls of men. They ran to the opposite extreme in Ohio and in the Eastern States. I blame not the Christians for opposing such doctrines; but I do blame the more intelligent among them, that they did not labor to allay those prejudices of the people by teaching them the truth, and not to cherish them, as many of them did in their periodicals and public preaching. Nor were they only blamable; some of the Reformers are equally worthy of blame, by rejecting the name Christian, as a family name, because the old Christians had taken it before them. At

[10] Rogers, Samuel. *The Cane Ridge Meeting House, Autobiography*, 204.

this posterity will wonder, when they know that the sentiment was published in one of our most popular periodicals, [11] and by one in the highest standing among us.'' [12]

Stone felt very keenly his rejection by some of the ''Christians,'' and the lack of confidence shown by many Disciples, but he held fast to his principles. In defence of and in explanation of his views, he penned the following noble words:

''It is not wonderful that the prejudices of the old Christian Church should be great against us, and that they should so unkindly upbraid me especially, and my brethren in Kentucky, for uniting with the Reformers. But what else could we do, the Bible being our directory? Should we command them to leave the foundation on which we stood—the Bible alone—when they had come upon the same? By what authority could we command? Or should we have left this foundation to them and have built another? Or should we have remained and fought with them for the sole possession? They held the name Christian as sacred as we did, they were equally averse from making opinions the test of fellowship, and equally solicitous for the salvation of souls. This union I view as the noblest act of my life.

''In the fall of 1834, I moved my family to Jacksonville, Illinois. Here I found two churches—a Christian and Reformers' church. They worshipped in separate places. I refused to unite with either until they united to-gether, and labored to effect it. It was effected. I never suffered myself to be so blinded by prejudice in favor of or against any that I could not see their excellencies or defects. I have seen wrongs in the Reformers, and in the old Christians,

---

[11] The *Millennial Harbinger.*

[12] Rogers, Samuel. *The Cane Ridge Meeting House, Autobiography,* 203, 204.

and in candor have protested against them. This has exposed me to the darts of both sides.'' [13]

Although union was not so easily brought about elsewhere as in Kentucky, thousands of ''Christians'' did join the Reformers. After referring to the union effected by Stone in Jacksonville, M. T. Morrill, the leading historian of the Christian Connection, made the following admission:

''Then followed a wave of 'Campbellism' that swept the Christians off their feet, and aggregated about eight thousand accessions to the Disciples. No Christian churches long survived in Tennessee, their cause was ruined in Kentucky and never has regained its former strength or prestige. Of the Southern Ohio Christians a majority of the preachers embraced Campbellism prior to 1837, and only about one thousand church members remained. A man named C. A. Eastman, traveling through Indiana about 1846, reported that, 'In many places they [the Christians] have amalgamated with the Disciples, and are known only as the same people.' Several years later it was reported that on Stone's account conferences of the Christians had been dissolved and churches disbanded, and the people had become amalgamated with the Disciples.'' [14]

Since these two bodies—the Christians and the Disciples—both exist now and are often confused, it may be worth while to note briefly their points of resemblance and of difference, many of which were apparent at first, all now. The main points of likeness are:

[13] Rogers, Samuel. *The Cane Ridge Meeting House, Autobiography*, 204.

[14] *History of the Christian Denomination*, 304.

1. Both acknowledge the term "Christian."

2. Both are opposed to a written creed.

3. Both preach frequently in favor of Christian union.

4. Both favor open communion by inviting to the Lord's table all followers of Christ.

5. Both have a congregational government derived from Bible acts and phrases.

6. Both give great prominence to the importance of conforming to Bible doctrines and commands.

7. Both receive into church fellowship those whom Christ has accepted without respect to what is usually termed "dogma."[15]

Some of the main points of difference are:

1. The Christians accept only the one name. The Disciples accept the name "Church of Christ," or "Churches of Christ," "Christian," and "Disciples of Christ."

2. The Christians have no written creed except the Bible. The Disciples have a consensus of opinion, and thus will not receive a member unless he is immersed for the remission of sins. Christians teach immersion, but they accept church members on profession and character.[16]

3. Christians acknowledge no leader but Jesus Christ. "But," says Summerbell,

"the Disciples are supposed to accept Alexander Campbell as the founder of their church; and because of this

---

[15] Summerbell, J. J. *The Christians and Disciples*, 2, 3.
[16] *Ibid.*, 3-7.

fact are sometimes called Campbellites.[17] The Disciples are called Campbellites in two senses. In one sense it is only a nickname, and should not be used. In the other sense it is correct, being descriptive of their theology, as being that of Alexander Campbell, who with great success taught the doctrine of immersion in water in order to remission of sin.''[18]

4. Christians do not lay particular stress upon certain doctrines, whereas the Disciples emphasize all those relating to the steps in salvation, and especially to the thirteen or more passages referring to baptism.[19]

5. Christians interpret the Bible so as to extend fellowship to all desirous of being saved, whereas the Disciples by their insistence on certain things, as immersion, shut out many. Says Whitaker, who is more bitter and less accurate than Summerbell:

''The Campbellites offer a platform on which even a *majority* of the Christians of the world can never hope to unite, for their distinctive, doctrinal tests of fellowship are not, never have been, and certainly never will be, universally

[17] On these points Summerbell and Whitaker are followed as much as possible, but justice requires a statement for the other side. A strict Disciple will not acknowledge Alexander Campbell as the founder of his religion. In common with members of other churches, he will claim that Jesus Christ is the founder. Neither will a radical Disciple answer to the term "Campbellite." He will attribute the use of such an expression either to ignorance or a deliberate attempt at insult. Concerning this point, A. S. Haynes, in his *History of the Disciples of Christ in Illinois* (page 22), wrote: "But this, to the Disciples of Christ, has always been an offensive nickname. Now it is no longer in use except in some back precincts where the trees grow tall and the brush thick, hence the light of intelligence is slow in penetrating."

[18] Summerbell, J. J. *Christians and Disciples*, 7.

[19] *Ibid.*, 8-10.

accepted among true Christians, and their door is so narrow that the conscience of millions of the best and biggest Christians of all ages cannot be squeezed through it.'' [20]

At this point, the following conclusions may be stated. With the Christians the idea of union of all men under Christ was predominant; hence communion and baptism were not stressed. Moreover, this same union sentiment led to the gathering in of as many as possible, and the consequent emphasis on preaching, revivals, and the mourners' bench. With the Disciples, exact conformity to primitive faith and doctrine was dominant. They believed in gathering in the good and casting away the bad; hence the emphasis was placed on teaching. The two elements working together formed a mighty force, but the evangelism of Stone's followers and Walter Scott supplied the religious energy.

During part of the period covered by this book, opposition and persecution were marked. Something has already been stated in regard to the antagonism and persecution from Presbyterians and Baptists. More will now be given concerning the attitude of the latter as well as of other religious bodies. Some of the mildest ways in which opposition was shown were by the absolute refusal of religious parties to allow Reformers to speak in their

[20] *Vital Distinctions between Christians and Campbellites*, 14. Summerbell and Whitaker are careful to point out that the "Christians" existed a quarter of a century before the Reformers separated from the Baptists, but both apparently overlook the fact that in spite of this, the "Christians" now number less than 125,000, whereas the Disciples number nearly 1,500,000.

churches, by detraction, and by misrepresentations. In the West, churches were repeatedly locked against them, and misrepresentations freely circulated. This was especially pronounced after the Kentucky union. Thus, on one occasion when John Smith was announced to preach at the Forks near Lancaster, Kentucky, in May of 1833, the church was locked against him, and the report spread that he was in prison at Mt. Sterling for stealing forty hogs. Smith came to his appointment and spoke from a temporary stage prepared for the occasion. Urged to answer the charge, he began:

"Friends and brethren, it has been asserted by some highly respectable, and, of course, very reliable gentlemen, that I am now in the Mount Sterling jail for stealing forty shoats, and, consequently, that I am not expected to preach here to-day. Now, whatever may be true about the hogs, of one thing you may rest assured: I am not in jail to-day. Of this fact, even my sectarian friends will be convinced before I leave. The Lord knows, brethren, that in all my life, I have never looked on any place more like to jail than yonder lonesome house, with its cold, stony walls and iron bars. To my eyes, that building is more like a place for criminals than a home for peaceful and happy Christians.

"But I am glad to find that my sectarian friends have become so morally nice as to condemn the stealing of a few hogs; we may now hope that they will quit worse crimes. Whatever may be thought of stealing, I solemnly affirm that, bad as it is, it is not so mean a thing, nor so injurious to society, as the wanton slander of an honest reputation.

"If a decent community ought to frown upon a thief that steals a few paltry hogs, perhaps to feed his hungry family, with what contempt should they spurn the wretch

that defames, by falsehood, a preacher of the Gospel of Jesus Christ—a father, too, of innocent children, who can leave them no other legacy than a pure and reputable life! Truly,

> 'He that steals my purse, steals trash;
> But he that filches from me my good name
> Robs me of that which not enriches him,
> And makes me poor indeed.' ''[21]

One of the accusers, sitting near by, cried out: "It was not you; it was another Smith." He then went on to specify Thomas Smith, who, unknown to the man implicating him, was on the platform. John Smith turned to the new culprit, and said: "Brother Tom, I know it to be a city ordinance of Lexington, where you live, that no man shall suffer his hogs to run at large, or about the streets. If, then, you have those forty shoats, tell this gentleman where you have hid them." Thereupon, the elder, somewhat irritated, replied, "I know nothing about his hogs." Smith once more addressed the stranger: "Sir, Thomas Smith, whom it appears you do not know, is now here on the stand with me; but he says that he knows nothing about those hogs. However, he will be here in the neighborhood for some days yet, and you can take him up whenever you please." The accusers, who were near and whose names Smith now had, were dumb, and soon left the audience.[22]

A little later, at Mount Pleasant, the Baptists locked the church and placed a guard on the horse

[21] Williams, J. A. *Life of Elder John Smith*, 418, 419.
[22] *Ibid.*, 419, 420.

block and over the rail fence. Smith preached from a gig lashed by its shafts to a walnut tree, and the people placed blankets and saddles on the grass for seats. Later on, in the same year, at the same place the Disciples prepared some rude benches, which were used one Saturday afternoon. They expected a happy meeting on the next day, but during the night their benches were piled up and burned to ashes. Feeling ran high, but Smith now, without asking leave, stood upon the horse block and calmed the people by saying:

"Bad as this is, my brethren, Christians have often fared much worse. *Your benches* only have been burnt; but *they* were bound to the stake and burnt to death for the sake of Jesus and his Word. Let us be patient toward our enemies, who can do us no more harm; and let us be thankful to our heavenly Father, that matters are no worse than they are."[22]

In the East, also, opposition was strong, though it was not carried so far as in the West. At New York, Alexander Campbell was refused the use of the Baptist meeting houses. One of his warmest personal friends, Archibald McClay, denied him his church because "he was not in full fellowship with the Baptists." At Philadelphia, he met with similar treatment. A Mr. Chambers, who with his Presbyterian congregation had rejected creeds some years before, expressed a wish that he occupy his pulpit, but possibly because of the Baptists his elders refused their consent. Consequently, Camp-

[22] Williams, J. A. *Life of Elder John Smith*, 420-422.

bell spoke in a house courteously offered by the Universalists.[24]

In a former chapter, references were made to the resolutions of exclusion in connection with the numerical increase of the Reformers, but now a few actual individual cases will be considered and more instances of opposition given. Hayden mentioned several. On the fourth Monday in June, 1829, the Church of Christ in Sharon, Ohio, was formed. Seventeen came from the Baptists then, and more later. About thirty members were enrolled in the new church on the first day. The Baptist Church followed a policy of non-intercourse. A resolution was passed excluding the wives of Benjamin Reno and James Morford because they had communed with the Disciples. The first, a deacon, rose and vainly protested against the act. Morford, deacon and clerk, refused to be a party to the proceeding. Both men withdrew from the Baptist Church and united with the Disciples.[25] On August 7, 1829, the Church of Christ was organized at Perry, as the direct result of Baptist bigotry. David Parmly, a zealous Baptist, having heard of the Disciple revival at Mentor, went over from Perry to hear the preaching. He was pleased, and communed with the Reformers. News quickly reached Perry, and the matter was taken up at once. Parmly pleaded his right as a free man in

[24] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 392.

[25] Hayden, A. S. *Early History of Disciples in Western Reserve*, 269.

Christ to hold fellowship with those who had also been "buried by baptism into his death." This plea was denied, and a church meeting was called to try him on the following charge of heresy, "Brother Parmly is charged with communing with the Campbellites, and believing in the doctrines of Alexander Campbell." Since no defence was allowed, he was immediately declared guilty.[26]

One other instance from Hayden must suffice—the origin of the church at Eagleville. The Baptist Church there had passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we do not fellowship the doctrines and sentiments published and advocated by Alexander Campbell and his associates. Neither will we fellowship as members in our church those who patronize or make a practice of reading his periodical publications, or those who are in any way trammeled with his doctrines or his sentiments."[27]

Eben A. Mills, a devoted Bible student, a fine musician and clerk of the church, was tried for reading the *Millennial Harbinger*. He pleaded:

1. His right as a Christian to "prove all things" by the Bible and to "hold fast that which was good."

2. His right as an American citizen to the free use of all things which injured no one, and restrained no other person's privileges.

The case was one of creed pure and simple. The church record reads:

[26] Hayden, A. S. *Early History of Disciples in Western Reserve*, 347.

[27] *Ibid.*, 351.

"March 2, 1833. It was then motioned and seconded that as Bro. E. A. Mills will not consent to abandon the reading of Mr. Campbell's 'Millennial Harbinger,' which we think is leading him from the gospel and the faith of the regular Baptists, we withdraw from him the hand of fellowship. The vote was then tried and carried by a considerable majority. The office of clerk being now vacant, Cornelius Udall was unanimously chosen clerk."[28]

Since Mills and his wife were very popular, however, an effort was made in their behalf. A mild and respectful remonstrance, signed by eighteen people, was prepared and sent to the church, but every one who signed it was expelled. Nine people took the lead in this wholesale excommunication, but their action was silently acquiesced in by the others, some eighty in number, without approval or demur. Thus nine members excluded eighteen.[29]

In the case of the individual churches the action was, therefore, much the same as in the associations. The Beaver Resolutions, previously referred to,[30] had been widely circulated. The Franklin Association of Kentucky passed them without change. In June, 1830, Tate's Creek Association excluded the Reformers, passed the Beaver Resolutions, and added the following:

"9. That there is no special call to the ministry.

"10. That the law given by God to Moses is abolished.

---

[28] Hayden, A. S. *Early History of Disciples in Western Reserve*, 352, 353.

[29] *Ibid.*, 353.

[30] See pages 182, 183.

"11. That there is no mystery in the Scriptures." [31]

This association named six preachers who were accused of heresies. The report was bitter: "We have seen associations thrown into commotion, churches divided, neighbor made to speak evil of neighbor, brother arrayed against brother, the father against the son, and the daughter against the mother." [32] Action was taken in this case by ten out of the twenty-six churches composing the association.[33] The exclusion movement soon spread to Virginia, where it was led by two of the most prominent Baptists of the time—Robert Semple and Andrew Broaddus. After passing the Beaver Resolutions, the Appomattox Association, at its meeting in 1830, added the following:

"1. Resolved, that it be recommended to all the churches composing this Association, to discountenance the writings of Alexander Campbell.

"2. Resolved, etc., not to countenance the new translation of the New Testament.[34]

"3. Resolved, etc., not to invite into their pulpit any minister who holds the sentiments in the Beaver anathema." [35]

---

[31] Gates, E. *History of the Disciples of Christ*, 162, 163.

[32] *Ibid.*, 163.

[33] *Ibid.*, 163.

[34] Baptists, contrary to the expectation of some people, objected to Campbell's use of the word "immerse" in place of "baptize," for in carrying out this general idea he used "John the Immerser" instead of "John the Baptist," thereby striking a blow at the name of the Baptist church.

[35] Gates, E. *History of the Disciples of Christ*, 164.

Perhaps the most influential action was taken by Dover Association, which included in its membership the churches of Richmond and vicinity and such men as Semple and Broaddus. It drew up a long list of heresies which it passed in December, 1830. The meeting was called out of the regular time, no notice being sent to Reformers, in order to begin action against persons in the association who had been preaching doctrines deemed heretical. After passing the association, the resolutions were turned over to the churches. When they came before Semple's congregation, they were rejected, although Semple and Broaddus were both present. In 1832, the Dover Association withdrew fellowship from six ministers who had taken the name of Reformers.[86]

Naturally, because of their close connection and the internal strife entailed by separation, the Baptists were long bitter against the Disciples. Nevertheless, A. H. Newman, their greatest historian, strove to be fair to Alexander Campbell, the man who more than any other was offensive to the Baptists and responsible for the division. Said Newman:

"Alexander Campbell was a man of fair education and of unbounded confidence in his resources and his tenets. He was possessed of a powerful personality and was one of the ablest debaters of his age. In the use of caricature and sarcasm he has rarely been surpassed. Throughout the regions that he chose for the propagation of his views the

[86] Gates, E. *History of the Disciples of Christ*, 165.

number of Baptist ministers who could in any way approach him in argumentative power or in ability to sway the mass of the people was very small. . . .''[37]

Bitter opposition, however, was not confined to the Presbyterians and Baptists alone. It was shown by other religious bodies, and especially by the Methodists. Peter Cartwright, one of the famous Methodist ministers of early days, was very radical against the Disciples, ''Christians,'' or ''New Lights,'' which terms he used as synonymous. Thus he wrote:

''Soon the Shaker priests came along, and off went McNemar, Dunlevy, and Huston into that foolish error. Marshall and others retraced their steps. B. W. Stone stuck to his New Lightism, and fought many bloodless battles, till he grew old and feeble, and the mighty Alexander Campbell, the *great*, arose and poured such floods of water about the old man's cranium, that he formed a union with this giant errorist, and finally died, not much lamented out of the circle of a few friends. And this is the way with all the New Lights, in the government, morals, and discipline of the church.

''This Christian, or New Light Church, is a feeble and scattered people, though there are some good Christians among them. . . .''[38]

Out in Illinois, Cartwright, after a very heavy rain, had this conversation with a ''New Light'' preacher named Roads. The circuit rider recorded the exchange of words thus:

[37] *A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*, 489.
[38] *Autobiography of Peter Cartwright*, 32, 33.

"'Good morning, Sir.

'Good morning,' he replied.

Said I, 'We have had a tremendous rain.'

'Yes, sir,' said he, 'the Lord sent that rain to convince you of your error.'

'Ah,' said I, 'what error?'

'Why, about baptism. The Lord sent this flood to convince you that much water was necessary.'

'Very good, sir,' said I; 'and he in like manner sent this flood to convince you of your error.'

'What error?' said he.

'Why,' said I, 'to show you that water comes by pouring and not by immersion.'"[39]

Soon after this conversation, Roads moved away, whereupon Cartwright remarked, "His New Light went out because there was 'no oil in the vessel.'"[40] Other Methodist writers, besides Cartwright, were particularly irritated by the question of baptism. James Shaw, another one of their ministers, writing in 1867, after treating the Roman Catholic, the Unitarian, and Universalist churches as unevangelical, continued:

"Swedenborgians, Tunkers, Shakers, Winebrennerians, Christians and Campbellites form the completion of the minor unevangelical sects, most of whom are immersionists in their views of baptism. The largest of these sects is the last mentioned. They are the followers of the late Alexander Campbell, an Irishman by birth, a Presbyterian minister in his younger days, a Baptist after, and lastly the founder of a sect who are numerous in the west. Mr. Campbell was a fine scholar, an eloquent controversialist, and a voluminous

[39] *Autobiography of Peter Cartwright*, 251.
[40] *Ibid.*, 251.

writer. He died a year ago. His followers first assumed the name of Reformers, then Disciples, now Christians, and by others are known as Campbellites. Mr. Campbell and his followers made an earnest attack on the leading doctrines and institutions of the churches, and in their stead offered to the people *salvation through immersion.* He ridiculed the necessity of a change of heart, or the profession of the forgiveness of sins in any other way than by baptism. So easy a form of religion soon took hold of the indifferent and the irreligious; the system became popular, and thousands left the Baptist church, and some the Presbyterians and others to join it, so that the denomination is made up of nearly all kinds of isms—Unitarians, Universalists, and the apostates from other churches—the only bond of unity among them being *baptism for the remission of sins.* This denomination is feeling the outside pressure of the evangelical churches around them, and as a consequence, they are becoming more evangelical themselves. They are at present in a transition state, and probably will, ere long, merge into the Baptist church from whence they came, or, being evangelized in spirit and doctrine become useful in society; otherwise they are destined to melt away. Whenever the piety and zeal of evangelical churches become low and lukewarm, then the *un*evangelical prosper; and as soon as the orthodox are revived and flourish, the others die and perish.''[41]

In a more bitter attack later on, Shaw wrote:

''In and around this town [Niantic, apparently in the Decatur circuit] there was a large number of Campbellites, a sect to whom I referred in *Chapter* X, on the American churches. They viewed with jealousy the encroachments of the Methodists. As they are generally fond of controversy, and their preachers flippant proclaimers of the *Gospel in Water,* their sermons are a strange medley of all sorts of stuff about *Salvation* by immersion. Their style—that of

[41] *Twelve Years in America,* 164, 165.

an auctioneer, reserving their wit and railing for other churches, and their praises for their own. Bible, missionary societies, Sunday-schools, and colleges, received their loudest denunciations. Things the most sacred they ridiculed, and institutions the most solemn they reviled. The Sabbath they disregarded; the forgiveness of sins, a change of heart, they laughed at, unless what was connected with immersion. The Divinity of Christ they did not generally believe in; the Personality and operation of the Holy Spirit they scoffed at. They were literally immersed infidels, having little of the form or power of godliness. Where evangelical churches were cold and lukewarm, these prospered; but when alive and earnest, the Campbellites sank to their coverts by the waters.'' [a]

In addition to doctrinal differences and the numerical losses of other bodies, there were further reasons for opposition, especially of the ministers. Alexander Campbell was a radical iconoclast. At first he opposed a paid clergy, and his attacks on the salaried preachers were exceptionally bitter. At the close of his debate with Walker, June 19, 20, 1820, he said:

''You have heard and patiently attended to this tedious debate. What are you now to do? I will answer this question for you: Go home and read your Bibles; examine the testimonies of those holy oracles; judge for yourselves, and be not implicit followers of the clergy. Amongst the clergy of different denominations, I charitably think, there are a few good men; but, as a body of men, they have taken away the key of knowledge from the people. And *how*, do you say. By teaching you to look to them for instruction as children to a father; by preventing you from judging for yourselves,

[a] *Twelve Years in America*, 294.

through an impression that you are not competent to judge for yourselves. This is the prevailing opinion with many. . . . I do not say that all the clergy are doing so, but I am sure that a vast majority of them are doing so.''[43]

When the *Christian Baptist* was founded, three years later, the attacks became much stronger. The articles on the *Clergy*[44] deservedly aroused intense opposition and served to explain, if not entirely justify, some of the bitter things said of the Reformers. In the introduction, ''The Origin of the Christian Clergy, Splendid Meeting Houses, and Fixed Salaries, Exhibited from Ecclesiastical History,'' Campbell repeated a statement made about seven years earlier, and gave his object thus:

'' 'The present popular exhibition of the Christian religion is a compound of judaism, heathen philosophy and Christianity.' From this unhallowed commixture sprang all political ecclesiastical establishments, a distinct order of men called clergy or priests, magnificent edifices as places of worship, tithes or fixed salaries, religious festivals, holy places and times, the Christian circumcision, the Christian passover, the Christian Sabbaths, etc., etc. These things we hope to exhibit at full length in due time.''[45]

He concluded his first article as follows:

''In the meantime, we conclude that one of those means used to exalt the clergy to dominion over the faith, over the conscience, and over the persons of men, by teaching the people to consider them as specially called and moved by the

[43] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 27.

[44] August 3, 1823; October 6, 1823; November 3, 1823; December 1, 1823; January 5, 1824; February 2, 1824.

[45] The *Christian Baptist*, August 3, 1823.

Holy Spirit, and sent to assume the office of ambassadors of Christ, or ministers of the Christian religion, is a scheme unwarranted by God, founded on pride, ignorance, ambition, and impiety; and as such, ought to be opposed and exposed by all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.'' [46]

In the second article, he declared:

''The systems of what is called 'church government,' which the respective sects have adopted, though differing in many respects, all agree in this, that whomsoever they will, they kill; and whomsoever they will, they save alive—not their bodies we mean, but their reputation for 'piety and orthodoxy.' Few of those confederations, now-a-days, even of those who propose authoritatively to determine matters of faith, cases of conscience and rules of practice, literally kill those whom they condemn to suffer the vengeance of their censures. But there is a species of robbery which is worse than taking a man's property; and there is a species of murder worse than taking a man's life; and of both of these ecclesiastical courts are, even in this age, often guilty. . . .'' [47]

In the third number, Campbell compared the holy alliance of kings and the holy alliance of clergy: ''But in fact the analogy appears perfect in every instance; the allied monarchs and the allied clergy resemble a monstrous production of nature which we once saw, two bodies united, and but one soul.'' [48]

---

[46] The *Christian Baptist*, October 6, 1823.

[47] *Ibid.*, November 3, 1823.

[48] *Ibid.*, December 1, 1823. This was written soon after leading European powers under the guidance of Metternich had prepared to crush out democratic movements affecting the countries concerned. For an account of the Holy Alliance and the Congresses at Aix-la-Chapelle, Troppau, Laibach, and Verona, see Hazen, C. D. *Europe Since 1815*, 57-65.

One of the most cutting and sarcastic of these articles was the fourth. In a very bitter vein, Campbell spoke of the educated clergy:

"A clergyman, thus qualified, can deliver a very popular and orthodox sermon without any grace; as easily as a lawyer can plead the cause of his client without grace. If a lawyer can be so much interested in the cause of his client as to be warmly eloquent; if his soul can be so moved by sympathy, as it often is, even to seek relief in copious tears, without the influence of grace or supernatural aid, why may not a clergyman be elevated to the same degree or to a higher degree of zeal, of warmth, of sympathy, of deep distress, in his pathetic addresses from the pulpit? Again, if one so well versed in theology, as to be able to comprehend, in one view, all the divinities, from the crocodiles, the gods of Egypt, up to Olympic Jove, or the venerable Saturn, as any clergyman from his youthful studies is; if a competent acquaintance with the sublimities of natural religion, and with the philosophical mysteries of scholastic divinity, cannot be eloquent, animated, and orthodox without grace, he must indeed be as stupid as an ass."[49]

In the same issue, the editor attacked the character of the clergy and their greed for money:

"The most favorable opinion which we could form of the regular clergy, is, that if there be, say, for the sake of precision, five thousand of them in the United States, five thousand carpenters, and five thousand doctors; there is an equal number of Christian carpenters, of Christian doctors, or any other trade, proportionately according to their aggregate number, as there is of Christian clergy. If we err in this opinion, our error is on the side of charity for the clergy. For we conceive it would be much easier to prove

[49] The *Christian Baptist*, January 5, 1824.

from the bible and from reason, that in five thousand carpenters, masons, tailors, farmers, there is a larger proportion, in each, of members of the kingdom of God, than in the same number of regularly educated ministers.'' [50]

In concluding this exceptionally bitter article, Campbell wrote:

''But, to resume the young clergyman where we left him, working by the day as a licentiate; he preaches, he travels, he explores 'vacant churches,' he receives his per diem, his daily compensation. Like a young gentleman in quest of a wife, who visits the 'vacant' ladies; forms an acquaintance with the most charming, the best accomplished, until he finds one to whom he can give his heart and hand; the nuptial engagements are formed, and the ceremonies of marriage are completed; he settles down into domestic life and builds up his house. So the young priest, in quest of a 'vacant church,' forms as extensive an acquaintance as possible with all the unmarried establishments of this character, pays court to the most charming, *i. e.*, the most opulent and honorable, if he be a young gentleman of high standing, until he find one that answers his expectations. A 'call' is presented and accepted. His reverend seniors come to the celebration of his nuptials—with holy hands they consecrate him—he vows to be a faithful teacher of the doctrines of the sect, a loving pastor of the flock, and they vow to be to him a faithful congregation, to support him according to promise, to *love* him for the work's sake, and to be obedient to his authority until God separate them—by death—no, but until he gets another and a louder call from some 'vacant church' who falls in love with him, and for whom he is known to possess feelings incompatible with his present married state. Thus he is consecrated a priest for life or good behavior, and then he sets about building up his cause and interest

[50] The *Christian Baptist*, January 5, 1824.

which is ever afterwards represented and viewed as the cause and interest of Christ.''[51]

In the fifth article the editor asserted with great vigor that money was the bond of union and the rock upon which popular churches were built:

''Money, I think, may be considered not merely as the bond of union in popular establishments, but it is really the rock on which the popular churches are built. Before church union is proposed, the grand point to ascertain is, are we able to support a church? Before we give a call, let us see, says the prudent saint, what we can 'make up.' A meeting is called—the question is put, 'How much will you give?' It goes round. Each man writes his name or makes his mark. A handsome sum is subscribed. A petition is sometimes presented to the legislature for an act of incorporation to confirm their union and to empower them to raise by the civil law, or the arm of power, the stipulated sum. All is now secure. The church is founded upon this rock. It goes into operation. The parson comes. Their social prayers, praises, sacraments and fasts commence; everything is put into requisition. But what was the *primum mobile?* What the moving cause? Money. As proof of this, let the congregation decrease by emigration or death; the money fails; the parson takes a missionary tour; he obtains a louder call; he removes. Money failed is the cause; and when this current freezes, social prayers, praises, 'sacraments,' sermons and congregational fasts all cease. Money, the foundation, is destroyed, and down comes the superstructure raised upon it. Reader, is not this fact? And dare you say that money is not the basis of the modern religious establishments? It begins with money, and it ends when money fails. Money buys Æsop's fables for the destined priest; money consecrates him to office, and a monied con-

[51] The *Christian Baptist*, January 5, 1824.

tract unites him and his parish. The Church of Jesus Christ is founded upon another basis, nourished by other means, is not dissolved by such causes, and will survive all the mines of Peru, all the gold of Ophir. The modern clergy say they do not preach for money. Very well; let the people pay them none, and they will have as much of their preaching still. Besides, there will be no suspicion of their veracity.''[52]

Campbell's comparison of the clergy to the Jewish leaders whom Christ so bitterly denounced, as in the twenty-third chapter of *Matthew*, was particularly galling:

''Against whom did the holy prophets of the Jews, the Savior of the world and his apostles inveigh with the utmost severity?

''Ans. The popular clergy. Never were any things spoken by the Saviour of the world, or by the holy apostles with so much severity as their reproofs of, as their denunciations against, the popular clergy.

''Who were the popular clergy in those days?

''Ans. Those who pleased the people, taught for hire and established themselves into an order, distinct from the people.

''Who are the popular clergy now?

''Ans. Those who are trained for the precise purpose of teaching religion as their calling, please the mass of the people, establish themselves into a distinct order, from which they exclude all who are not so trained, for hire, affect to be the only legitimate interpreters of revelation.''[53]

Probably the most stinging and virulent of all Campbell's articles was the so-called ''Third Epistle of Peter, to the Preachers and Rulers of Congrega-

[52] The *Christian Baptist*, February 2, 1824.
[53] *Ibid.*, February 2, 1824.

tions—A Looking Glass for the Clergy.'' This ironical epistle was divided into four chapters: The Style and Manner of Living, Choosing of Ministers, Performance of Preaching, and The Clergy's Reward. Since the latter chapter is typical, and in a way summarizes what had gone before in his writings, it will be quoted entire:

''' 'In all your gettings' get money! Now, therefore, when you go forth on your ministerial journey, go where there are silver and gold, and where each man will pay according to his measure. For verily I say you must get your reward.

''Go you not forth as those that have been sent, 'without two coats, without gold or silver, or brass in their purses; without scrip for their journey, or shoes or staves;' but go you forth in the good things of this world.

''And when you shall hear of a church that is vacant and has no one to preach therein, then be that a *call* to you, and be you mindful of the call, and take you charge of the flock thereof and of the fleece thereof, even of the *golden* fleece.

''And when you shall have fleeced your flock and shall know of another *call,* and if the flock be greater, then greater be also to you the call. Then shall you leave your old flock, and of the new flock shall you take the charge.

''Those who have 'freely received' let them 'freely give,' and let not men have your words 'without money nor without price,' but bargain you for hundreds and bargain for thousands, even for thousands of silver and gold shall you bargain.

''And over and above the price for which you have sold your service, take you also gifts, and be you mindful to refuse none, saying, 'Lo! I have enough,' but receive gifts from them that go in chariots, and from them that feed

flocks, and from them that earn their morsel by the sweat of their brow.

"Yea, take you gifts of all, and take them in gold and in silver, and in bread; in wine and in oil; in raiment and in fine linen.

"And the more that the people give you the more they will honor you; for they shall believe that 'in giving to you they are giving to the Lord;' for behold their sight shall be taken from them, and they shall be as blind as bats, and 'shall know not what they do.'

"And you shall wax richer and richer, and grow greater and greater, and you shall be lifted up in your own sight, and exalted in the eyes of the multitude; and lucre shall be no longer filthy in your sight. And verily you have your reward.

"In doing these things you shall never fail. And may abundance of gold and silver and banknotes, and corn, and wool, and flax, and spirits, and wine, and land be multiplied to you, both now and hereafter. Amen."[54]

From the above quotations it will be seen that such terms as "scrap doctors" and "textuary divines" which Campbell often applied to ministers were rather mild. By intimation, he said that Christians would not accept honorary titles. He wrote:

"In some eastern papers 'the Rev. Spencer H. Cone, a Baptist clergyman,' was reported as recently dubbed D.D. But this was a mistake. It was the Rev. Samuel H. Cox, who was dubbed and refused the honor. We are sorry to observe a hankering after titles amongst some baptists, every way incompatible with their profession; and to see the remarks lately made in the 'Columbia Star' censuring Mr. Cox for declining the honor. Those who deserve honorary

[54] The *Christian Baptist*, July 4, 1825.

titles are the least covetous of them. We have not met with any baptist bishop who is more worthy of a title of honor, if such these double D's be esteemed, than Robert B. Semple of Virginia; and when the degree was conferred on him, he, like a Christian, declined it.'' [55]

The Westerners also, as might be expected, were bitter against titles, and opposed their use longer than Campbell did. Thus, on one occasion, when the eccentric John Smith, familiarly known as ''Raccoon John Smith,'' was asked if he was not embarrassed when he spoke before an audience of lawyers and judges in the courthouse at Sparta, he replied: ''Not in the least, for I have learned that judges and lawyers, so far as the Bible is concerned, are the most ignorant class of people in the world—*except Doctors of Divinity.*'' [56]

These bitter attacks on the clergy aroused the greatest opposition, but other things played an important part. In the early days, Campbell was opposed to Bible, tract, and missionary societies, Sunday-schools, and associations. He regarded the first four as ''milking-schemes.'' He intimated that their object was to impoverish the many and enrich the few, and that their purpose was speculation and peculation. He feared that the Sunday-school would bring a national creed and a national church establishment. Much of this opposition was undoubtedly due to his poor opinion of the clergy, but the belief that these organizations were perverted to sectarian

[55] The *Christian Baptist*, February 6, 1826.
[56] Williams, J. A. *Life of Elder John Smith*, 397.

purposes also influenced him. Richardson, Campbell's son-in-law, wrote:

"In Sunday-schools the denominational catechism was then diligently taught, and the effort was made to imbue the minds of the children with partisan theology. Missionary societies then labored to propagate the tenets of the party to which each belonged, and even Bible societies seemed to him to be made a means of creating offices and salaries for a few clerical managers, who exercised entire control."[57]

With regard to associations, Campbell wrote:

"The power of an association is declared in fact to be inferior to the power of a single congregation. The association is not even a co-ordinate with, but subordinate to, a single congregation. Except as a meeting for mutual intelligence, exhortation, and comfort, they have nothing to do which cannot be undone by a single congregation. If then they attempt to imitate the ecclesiastic courts of other denominations, they become more awkward than the ass covered with the skin of the lion. They appear like a lion, but bray like an ass. . . ."[58]

A little more detail should be given to Campbell's early attitude towards missions. At first he believed that the attempt to convert the heathen by means of modern missionaries was unauthorized and hopeless. He thought that the migration of an ideal church of blameless, zealous Christians to a heathen land would accomplish much more good than the sending of missionaries. After describing this ideal church, he added:

[57] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 57.
[58] The *Christian Baptist*, August 7, 1826.

"If, in the present day, and amongst all those who talk so much of a missionary spirit, there could be found such a society, though it were composed of but twenty, willing to emigrate to some heathen land, where they would support themselves like the natives, wear the same garb, adopt the country as their own, and profess nothing like a missionary project; should such a society sit down and hold forth in word and deed the saving truth, not deriding the gods, not the religion of the natives, but allowing their own works and example to speak for their religion, and practicing as above hinted; we are persuaded that, in process of time, a more solid foundation for the conversion of the natives would be laid, and more actual success resulting, than from all the missionaries employed for twenty-five years. Such a course would have some warrant from scripture; but the present has proved itself to be all human."[59]

A little later Campbell answered the following queries:

"Did God ever *call* a man to any work for which he was not fully qualified, and in the performance of which he was not successful?

"Ans. No, if we except the modern preachers at home, and those called missionaries abroad. They say they are *specially called,* but neither their qualifications nor their success warrant the belief of these professions. With an open bible in my hand, I must say that God never called a man to any work for which he was not fully qualified, and in the performance of which he was not successful.

"If you believed yourself specially called by God to preach the gospel to the Birmans, what would you do?

"Ans. I would not ask the leave of any Board of Missions, nor their support, but, confiding in the power and faithfulness of him that called me, I would, without con-

[59] The *Christian Baptist,* September 1, 1823.

ferring with flesh and blood, depart, and look to Heaven for every provision, protection, and support, by land and sea, necessary for safe conduct thither, and also for success when I arrived. If I could not thus act, I could not believe myself called, nor expect success in the undertaking. This, reasons requires. But enthusiasm, superstition, or covetousness would prompt one to apply to flesh and blood for patronage and support, and at the same time to profess to be called by God and rely upon him for protection and success.'' [60]

All of the radical statements quoted were made early in Campbell's life. He changed front on many of these questions, and decidedly modified his later utterances. Thus, with the organization of the American Christian Missionary Society, he was elected its first president and served in that capacity for about fourteen years.[61] He donated his share of the proceeds arising from the publication of the Purcell-Campbell *Debate,* 1836, to the American and Foreign Bible Society and to the American Bible Society in equal portions. Early in 1838, the copyright of six cents per copy, had already brought in $800.[62] The proceeds of the Rice-Campbell *Debate,* 1843, went the same way.[63] Again, in 1864, he showed his changed views by giving the copyright of his hymn book to the American Christian Missionary Society.[64] Campbell's writings, moreover, began to show his changed views. The

[60] The *Christian Baptist,* March 1, 1824.
[61] The *Millennial Harbinger,* II., 413.
[62] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 433.
[63] *Ibid.,* II., 503.
[64] *Millennial Harbinger,* II., 415.

Millennial Harbinger evinced a growing desire for conciliation—for constructive work in place of destructive. Extracts quoted from the various prefaces in the *Millennial Harbinger Abridged* revealed the milder spirit of the editor. Thus a sentence from the preface in 1841 reads:

"In the present volume some points claim our special attention: such as, the necessity of a more conciliatory spirit towards the more evangelical professors—the necessity and practicability of the enjoyment of larger measures of spiritual influence—education in all its branches, domestic, scholastic, and ecclesiastic."[65]

Growing liberality in Campbell's views naturally led to more moderate dealings on the part of his opponents. Thus, about 1850, he noted a great change in the attitude and deportment of religious parties toward him.[66]

[65] *Millennial Harbinger*, I., XXIX.
[66] *Ibid.*, II., 413.

VII

TEACHINGS AND PRACTICES OF THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

AT this time it seems advisable to consider more carefully, though rather briefly, the teachings and practices of the Disciples of Christ. They differ from most church members in that they will not take a set of articles as a binding creed. They do not object to publishing what they understand to be the teaching of the Bible on subjects of faith or duty, but they do object to making such articles conditions of fellowship. Alexander Campbell, in the *Millennial Harbinger* for 1846,[1] published eight propositions as embodying his theological beliefs, and Isaac Errett, in *Our Position,*[2] set forth thirteen items of evangelical belief. Nevertheless, the only creed acceptable to all Disciples of Christ is that stated by Campbell in the preface to the second edition of his *Christian System:* "We take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as the foundation of Christian union and communion." B. B. Tyler, one of the leading historians of the movement, wrote: "The Disciples main-

[1] Page 385.
[2] Pages 6-11.

tain that the original creed of Christianity contained but a single article, namely, 'Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God,' and that all doctrinal tests but this must be abandoned."[8] He listed the following objections to creeds as conditions of fellowship:

1. They are without divine authority.

2. They have often worked to cast out the good, the intelligent, the pure, and to retain those of contrary characteristics.

3. Authoritative creeds have usually been proscriptive and overbearing.

4. Their general tendency has been to "dethrone the Prophet, Priest, and King ordained of God to teach, to make intercession, and to rule over the children of men."

5. Creeds seem to be prohibited by Bible precepts—2 *Timothy* 1:13, *Jude* 3, 2 *Thessalonians* 2:15, *Matthew* 17:5, and *Colossians* 1:18.

6. The first two hundred years of Christianity, when only the Bible was used as an authority, were the best.

7. Creeds often cause divisions.

8. They prejudice the mind against Bible teachings, and since they are abstract and prepared by trained thinkers, they are not readily understood by children and the untrained.

9. Creeds are unfavorable to a large development of genuine spirituality.

---

[8] *History of the Disciples of Christ*, 107. *Matthew* 16:16 quoted.

10. Without intending to do so, perhaps, "they assume to be plainer and more intelligible in their statements of truth than the Bible."

11. Human creeds have always been hostile to reformation by their tendency to expel pious and learned ministers of religion.

12. Creeds are absolutely superfluous with regard to detecting error.

13. They are formidable obstacles in the way of realizing Christ's prayer for union as recorded in *John* 17.[4]

Alexander Campbell wrote bitterly against creeds under the Parable of the Iron Bedstead. He began:

"In the days of the Abcedarian Popes it was decreed that a good Christian just measured three feet, and for the peace and happiness of the church it was ordained that an iron bedstead, with a wheel at one end and a knife at the other should be placed at the threshold of the church, on which the Christians should all be laid. This bedstead was just three feet in the casement on the exactest French scales. Every Christian, in those days, was laid on this bedstead; if less than the standard, the wheel and a rope was applied to him to stretch him to it; if he was too tall, the knife was applied to his extremities. In this way they kept the good Christians, for nearly a thousand years, all of one stature. Those to whom the knife or the wheel were applied either died in the preparation, or were brought to the saving standard."[5]

Campbell then went on to say that Luther used a four-foot standard, that Calvin added six inches,

[4] Tyler, B. B. *History of the Disciples of Christ*, 109-116.
[5] The *Christian Baptist*, October 2, 1826..

that the Independents made the standard five feet, and that the Baptists added six more inches. He continued:

"It is now expected that six inches will be humanely added; but this will only be following up an evil precedent; for experience has proved, that as soon as the iron bedstead is lengthened, the people will grow apace, and it will be found too short even when extended to six feet. Why not, then, dispense with this piece of popish furniture in the church, and allow Christians of every stature to meet at the same fireside and eat at the same table? The parable is just, and the interpretation thereof easy and sure."[6]

He concluded the article as follows:

"Suppose, then, that a number of churches should agree to throw aside the iron bedstead, and take the book in one chapter, and call it their Creed and Book of Discipline. What then? Oh! says Puritanus, Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, etc. etc. do this. Stop, my friend, not one of them dare trust themselves upon this bottom; they all have their creeds and disciplines to keep them from sinking. What then if an experiment should be made, and a fair trial of the adequacy of the Divine Book should be given; and whenever it fails of the promised end, let any other device be tried. But among all the experiments of this age and country, it is nowhere recorded that such a trial has been made and failed. I am aware of all that can be said on the other side, and still I assert that no such an experiment and result are on record. And, moreover, I do not think it is likely that it shall ever be proved by actual experiment that the New Testament, without a creed, is insufficient to preserve the unity, peace, and purity of any one congregation, or of those of any given district. But above all, let us

[6] The *Christian Baptist*, October 2, 1826.

have no more iron bedsteads, with or without wheels or knives.'' [7]

This question of creed was also discussed in the West. Two men were debating the subject at Dry Run, Kentucky. One, a Calvinistic Baptist, maintained that his Confession of Faith was a better bond of union among Christians than the Bible alone. His anti-creed opponent was so sure of his position that he proposed to submit the question to a Frenchman who had listened to the entire debate. The judge, making each disputant take into his hand the creed which he had defended, asked of the man with the New Testament who had made his creed.

''Jesus Christ,'' was the answer.

Turning to the other, he said: ''And who, my friend, made yours?''

''It was adopted in the city of Philadelphia, in the year 1742,'' came the reply.

The Frenchman continued: ''Very well, then, gentlemen, that is enough. If you follow your creed, Mr. Christian, when you die, it will take you to Jesus Christ. Follow yours, Mr. Baptist, and when you die, you will go to *Philadelphia.*'' [8]

The plan of salvation as accepted by the Disciples now, although first proclaimed by Walter Scott, may be stated in the words of Alexander Campbell:

[7] The *Christian Baptist*, October 2, 1826.
[8] Williams, J. A. *Life of Elder John Smith*, 402, 403.

"In the natural order of the evangelical economy, the items stand thus;—1. Faith; 2. Reformation [Repentance]; 3. Immersion; 4. Remission of sins; 5. Holy Spirit; and 6. Eternal Life. We do not teach that one of these precedes the other, as cause and effect; but they are all naturally connected, and all, in this order, embraced in the glad tidings of salvation. In the apostolic age these items were presented in this order."[9]

The conclusion of Robert Richardson's article on faith in the *Millennial Harbinger* gave the generally accepted definition:

"It is the cordial belief of this love of God, thus manifested in the life, death, resurrection and glorification of Christ, which reconciles man to God, which overwhelms the soul in penitence and contrition for its offences, and, through the influence of the Holy Spirit, produces an entire renovation of heart and reformation of character. In brief, it is Christ himself who is thus made to us "wisdom" and "righteousness," "sanctification and redemption."[10]

Faith, to Alexander Campbell, was the simple belief of testimony.[11] This teaching, as well as his ideas on repentance, received general acceptance among the Disciples. Campbell wrote, concerning the latter:

"Repentance is an effect of faith: for who that believes not that God exists can have 'repentance towards God'? Repentance is sorrow for sins committed; but it is more. It is a resolution to forsake them; but it is more. It is actual 'ceasing to do evil and learning to do well.' This

[9] The *Christian Baptist*, October 6, 1828.
[10] The *Millennial Harbinger Abridged*, II., 341.
[11] Campbell, A. *The Christian System*, 53.

is 'repentance unto life,' or what is truly called *reformation*. Such is the force of the command, 'Repent, every one of you.' It is not merely, Be sorry for what you have done wrong; nor is it, Resolve to do better; nor even try to amend your ways; but it is actual amendment of life from the views and the motives which the gospel of Christ exhibits. Gospel repentance is the offspring of gospel light and gospel motive, and therefore, it is the effect, and not the cause, of belief of the testimony of God.''[13]

Immersion as the only Scriptural form of baptism is still one of the distinguishing tenets of the Disciples of Christ, and by them it is inseparably connected with the remission of sins. The importance Alexander Campbell attached to this subject was thus brought out in his debate with W. L. MacCalla:

''I will first merely refer to the oracles of God which shew, that baptism is an ordinance of the greatest importance, and of momentous significance. Never was there an ordinance of so great import or design.—It is to be but *once* administered. We are to pray often, praise often, show forth the Lord's death often, commemorate his resurrection every week, but we are to be baptized but once. Its great significance may be seen from the following testimonies. The Lord saith, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' [15] He does not say, he that believeth, and keeps my commands, shall be saved: but he saith he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. He placeth baptism on the right hand of faith. Again he tells Nicodemus, that 'except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.' [16] Peter on the day of Pentecost

[13] *The Christian System*, 53, 54.
[15] *Mark* 16: 16.
[16] *John* 3: 5.

places baptism in the same exalted place. 'Repent,' says he, 'and *be baptized* every one of you For *the remission of sins.*' [15] Ananias saith to Paul, 'Arise and *be baptized* and Wash Away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord.' [16] Paul saith of the Corinthians, 'Ye were once fornicators, idolators, adulterers, effeminate, thieves, covetous, drunkards, rioters, extortioners, but ye were Washed in the *name* of the Lord Jesus,' [17] doubtless referring to their baptism. He tells Titus, God our Saviour *saved* us by the washing of Regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit—See again its dignified importance. Peter finishes the grand climax, in praise of baptism—'Baptism doth also now save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.' [18] I have thus, in the naked import of these testimonies, shown, that it is of vast *import,* of glorious design. . . .'' [19]

In introducing some essays on baptism in the *Christian Baptist,* the editor began:

''Immersion in water into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the fruit of faith in the subject, is the most singular institution that ever appeared in the world. Although very common in practice, and trite in theory, although the subject of a good many volumes, and of many a conversation, it appears to me that this institution of divine origin, so singular in its nature, and so grand and significant in its design, is understood by comparatively very few. In my debate with Mr. MacCalla in Kentucky, 1823, on this topic, I contended that it was a divine institution designed for putting the legitimate subject of it in actual possession of the remission of his sons—That to every believing subject it did formally, and in fact, convey to him the

[15] *Acts* 2: 38.
[16] *Acts* 22: 16.
[17] 1 *Corinthians* 6: 11.
[18] 1 *Peter* 3: 21.
[19] *A Debate on Christian Baptism between the Rev. W. L. MacCalla, a Presbyterian Teacher, and Alexander Campbell,* 116, 117.

forgiveness of sins. It was with much hesitation I presented this view of the subject at that time, because of its perfect novelty. I was then assured of its certainty. But having thought still more closely upon the subject, and having been necessarily called to consider it more fully as an essential part of the Christian religion, I am still better prepared to develope its import, and to establish its utility and value in the Christian religion. I beg leave to call the attention of the reader to it under the idea of the Bath of regeneration.''[20]

One further quotation from Campbell must suffice:

''Baptism is, then, designed to introduce the subject of it into the participation of the blessings of the death and resurrection of Christ, who 'died for our sins,' and 'rose again for our justification.' But it has no abstract efficacy. Without previous faith in the blood of Christ, and deep and unfeigned repentance before God, neither immersion in water, nor any other action, can secure to us the blessings of peace and pardon. It can merit nothing. Still to the believing penitent it is the *means* of receiving a formal, distinct, and specific absolution, or relief from guilt. Therefore, none but those who have first believed the testimony of God and have repented of their sins, and that have been intelligently immersed into his death, have the full and explicit testimony of God, assuring them of pardon. To such only as are truly penitent, dare we say, 'Arise and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord,' [21] and to such only can we say with assurance, 'You are washed, you are justified, you are sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God.' ''[22]

---

[20] The *Christian Baptist*, January 7, 1828.

[21] *Acts* 22: 16.

[22] 1 *Corinthians* 6: 11, and Campbell, A. The *Christian System*, 58.

Campbell and other early leaders declared, as previously stated, and present leaders among the Disciples insist that immersion is the only Scriptural baptism. They refer to Christ's journey of seventy miles to demand baptism at the hands of John the Baptist, to his going down into the water, and to his coming up out of the water.[23] "Why," they ask, "did John take Christ down into the water if he merely wanted to sprinkle a little water on his head?" Then they point out that John was baptizing at Enon near to Salim because there was *much* water there.[24] Again, they refer to Jesus' words to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God."[25] They emphasize the fact that Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch, like John the Baptist and Christ, went down into the water and came up out of the water.[26] They contend that only baptism represents a burial: "We were buried with him therefore through baptism unto death that like as Christ rose from the dead through the glory of the Father, so also we shall rise to walk in newness of life."[27] They maintain that all other so called forms of baptism are condemned by Paul's words, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism."[28] They insist that immersion was the only form practiced until 753, when

[23] *Matthew* 3: 16.
[24] *John* 3: 23.
[25] *John* 3: 5.
[26] *Acts* 8: 38, 39.
[27] *Romans* 6: 4.
[28] *Ephesians* 4: 5.

Pope Stephen allowed sprinkling in the case of sickness. Thus, they claim that the other forms, such as sprinkling and pouring, came into use through the Catholic Church. Disciples contend that all reputable Greek lexicographers translate *baptizo* as *immerse,* and they say with quite a little complacency: "Surely the Greeks understood their own language. How, then, do you account for the fact that the Greek Catholic Church is a church of immersed believers?"[29] Inasmuch as the Disciples consider faith and repentance as prerequisites to baptism, they necessarily rule out infant baptism.

The design and result of baptism, according to the Disciples of Christ, are shown in *Acts* 2:38: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ *for* the remission of your sins, and ye *shall* receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Alexander Campbell concluded his second essay on baptism as follows:

> "The first three thousand persons that were immersed after the ascension of Christ into heaven, were immersed *for the remission of their sins with the promise of the Holy Spirit.* I am bold, therefore, to affirm, that every one of them who, in the belief of what the apostle spoke, was immersed, did, in the very instant in which he was put under water, receive the forgiveness of his sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. If so, then, who will not concur with me in saying that Christian immersion is the gospel in water?"[30]

---

[29] J. V. Coombs, a Disciple evangelist, has an interesting chapter on baptism in his *Campaigning for Christ,* 78-104.

[30] The *Christian Baptist,* February 4, 1828. See the criticisms of Cartwright and Shaw on the "gospel in water," pages 209-212.

In his seventh essay on the subject, Campbell wrote:

"The first disciples, when immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of sins, obtained this blessing [gift of the Holy Spirit]. Those on Pentecost obtained also the very gifts contained in the promise made by Joel; and also all those communications couched in the above expressions. For they not only possessed miraculous gifts, but were filled with peace and joy, with all the fruit of the Spirit of Holiness. [31] How gracious this institution! It gives to the convert a sensible pledge that God, through the blood of Christ, has washed away his sins, has adopted him into his family, and made him an heir of all things through Christ. Thus, having his heart sprinkled from an evil conscience, and his body washed with clean water, he becomes a habitation of God through the Holy Spirit.—Thus according to the tenor of the New Testament, God dwells in him, and he in God, by the Spirit which is imparted to him. Thus he is constituted a christian or a disciple of Jesus Christ." [32]

The weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper is another distinguishing characteristic of the Disciples of Christ. This custom, according to them, has been practiced from the beginning. Luke said that the disciples met together on the first day of the week to break bread,[33] and Paul told the Corin-

[31] Many Disciples draw distinctions here. They note the tongues of fire and the gift of tongues in connection with the baptism of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost and at the household of Cornelius. They refer next to the gift of the Holy Spirit with miracle working power given by the laying on of the apostles' hands. Then they speak of the ordinary indwelling of the Holy Spirit promised to all penitent immersed believers in *Acts* 2: 38, 5: 32 and elsewhere.

[32] The *Christian Baptist*, July 7, 1828.

[33] *Acts* 20: 7.

thians: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup ye do show forth the Lord's death till he come again."[34] Justin Martyr declared that weekly communion was practiced by the early Christians.[35] Calvin said that every week at least the table of the Lord should be spread for Christian assemblies.[36] Because of these Bible references and the early customs referred to by Martyr and others, Disciples everywhere insist on weekly communion. Concerning this, Alexander Campbell wrote in 1837:

"Something was also said upon the conspicuity which this institution deserves in the weekly meetings of the family of God. The weekly meeting of the family of God, without any Lord's table or Lord's Supper is one of the poorest and most meagre things in creation. Miserably poor is that family, which, when assembled on some important occasion, has nothing to eat—not even a table in the house. Yet so poor is the family of God, if the numerous sects in our land give a fair representation of it. We cannot believe it. The disciples of Jesus always assembled on the Lord's day to commemorate the Lord's death and resurrection so long as the Christian religion continued pure and uncontaminated. It was shown that spiritual health, requires not only wholesome food, but at proper and regular intervals. Therefore, a person may as reasonably say that he can enjoy good animal health on one meal in four days, as that he can be healthy in the Lord on one Lord's supper in four weeks. And if it be so, that 'frequent communion,' as it is called, diminishes its value or solemnity, then the seldomer, the better. Once in a

[34] 1 *Corinthians* 11: 26.

[35] Gwatkins, H. M. *Selections from Early Writers Illustrative of Church History to the Time of Constantine*, 55.

[36] *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, II., 581.

life time, on that principle, is enough. Where there is no law there is no transgression. Where there is no precedent there is no error; and if it be left to every man's own sense of propriety, there can be no fault in only commemorating the Lord's death once in a life time. But if it be said that it is left to our own sense of propriety, then unless it can be shown that a whole church has one and the same sense of propriety, there can be no communion: for if it should seem fit to ninety in the hundred to commune monthly or quarterly, and not to ten, then there is a schism in the church, or no communion. The first disciples met on the first day of the week to break bread, as Paul argues.'' [37]

Several of the early churches were rather insistent on a set order of service. The following form was a favorite one with some: prayer, praise, the Lord's Supper, the fellowship or collection for the saints, reading of the Scriptures—one passage from the Law, one from the prophets and one from the New Testament—exhortation by one of the elders or members, praise, prayer, and dismissal.[38] Other churches insisted on having the Lord's Supper at the very last, after which they sang a song and then separated. In their sincere attempts to follow Bible teachings, however, they sometimes went to extremes. They were too literal. Isaac Errett, one of the most talented leaders of the middle period, told a very amusing story of the use of the holy kiss at Pittsburg. One fine Sunday morning a ''big black'' negro went forward to take membership with the church of which Errett was then a

[37] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 220.
[38] Kirk, H. Van. *A History of the Disciples of Christ*, 89.

member. The Pittsburg custom was for the members to march round single file, extend the right hand of fellowship, and at the same time imprint a resounding "holy kiss" on the convert's cheek. When the time arrived for the ceremony to begin for the "brother in black," no one moved. All stood passive. The situation grew painful. Sensitive people began to wish that holes would open up in the floor through which they might escape, but just then a maiden sister of uncertain age came to the rescue. She rushed to the front, impulsively embraced her colored brother, implanted a fervent kiss on his dusky cheek, and shouted, "I will not deny my brother his privilege." "That," said Errett, "put an end to the holy kiss in the Pittsburg church." [89]

Oftentimes, also, the Disciples were too boastful about their exact conformity to the Bible doctrines. On one occasion, John Smith and a Methodist minister were riding along together in earnest conversation on religious subjects. Being overtaken by a heavy rain, they hurried to a little village and took shelter in a small shop, where several farmers had already preceded them. The people there were strangers, but the shop keeper, noticing that the two newcomers were cold and wet, placed a decanter of wine upon the counter and urged them to take a drink.

[89] Haley, J. J. *Makers and Molders of the Reformation Movement*, 77, 78.

The Methodist said: "You are the oldest, Brother Smith, help yourself first." Smith went forward and drank a little of the wine, whereupon he was upbraided as follows:

"Why, Brother Smith, you have been boasting for an hour past that you observe the Book more strictly than other people. I am surprised now to see that your practice does not accord with your profession, for you have just violated the plain injunction, that in all things, whether we eat or drink, we should give thanks!"

Smith admitted the correctness of the teaching, but stated that among strangers and on such an occasion he thought it permissible to enjoy the good things of the Lord without making a display of piety before men. He then urged his friend to drink, at the same time cautioning him to be careful to observe all commands. The Methodist poured out a glassful, set it down on the counter, and reverently closed his eyes. Smith seized the glass unobserved, emptied it at a mouthful, and replaced it on the table. His friend took up the glass, but, finding it empty, said, amid the laughter of the crowd: "That was some of your mischief, Brother Smith, I know." The culprit replied:

"Yes, and you have now let these good people see how a Methodist just half way obeys the Book. We are told to watch as well as to pray, my brother. You prayed well enough, but you neglected to watch, as the Scriptures command, and have lost both your wine and your argument by your disobedience."[40]

[40] Williams, J. A. *Life of Elder John Smith*, 411, 412.

One of the doctrines generally held by the Disciples which may be briefly mentioned here is that of the Bible dispensations. On August 30, 1816, Alexander Campbell preached his famous sermon on the law. He recognized three Bible dispensations, which, stated more briefly in the *Millennial Harbinger,* were:

"1st. The Patriarchal institution which continued from the fall of Adam to the Divine mission of Moses. 2d. The Jewish religion, which remained in force from Moses until the coronation of Jesus as Lord and Messiah; and 3d. The Christian economy, which continues from that time to the present and is never to be superseded by any other."[41]

Disciples teach that the Christian Church did not begin until the day of Pentecost. They claim that it was founded on Christ, the chief cornerstone,[42] and argue that it could not have been established during his life on earth, for he had told Peter, "Upon this rock [43] I will build my church,"[44] and, again, taking the kingdom of God and the church as synonymous, they refer to Joseph of Arimathea, who helped bury Christ, as yet awaiting the kingdom of God.[45] "Why would he wait," they ask, "if the kingdom had already been established?" Then, to clinch matters, they point

[41] *Millennial Harbinger Abridged*, II., 348. See pages 149-153.

[42] 1 *Corinthians* 3: 11.

[43] Disciples claim that the rock is the confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (*Matthew* 16: 16), and they require it from all converts.

[44] *Matthew* 16: 18.

[45] *Luke* 23: 51.

out that the church was never spoken of as in actual existence until after Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, "And the Lord added to the church daily such as were being saved."[46]

In common with certain other religious bodies, the Disciples of Christ hold to the congregational form of church government, that is, they believe that only the congregation has the right to elect and ordain officers.[47] The method and time of election vary widely now, as they did at first. No hard and fast rules can be laid down. A common, though by no means universal, plan among the Disciple churches is to hold an annual meeting open to all members. A chairman is at once elected, and the church clerk, who is often secretary of the official board, takes down the records. Reports from the minister, treasurer, and various committees and organizations are called for. In electing the officers, as trustees, elders and deacons, the secret ballot is generally preferred by the best churches. The officers constitute the official board, which elects its chairman and other necessary officers and transacts the church business. The board, however, whether elected at an annual congregational meeting or a general meeting of the church, often refers important questions to the congregation for approval or rejection. Thus, in the election of a minister, who becomes ex-officio an elder, the board usually asks the confirmation of the congregation.

[46] *Acts* 2: 47.
[47] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 117.

The duties of the trustees, of course, are much the same as in any organization, religious or otherwise; they relate to the holding of property. The Biblical qualifications and duties of elders and deacons as given by Paul[48] are generally insisted upon among Disciples. Bishops, according to them, should teach "the whole counsel of God" and "rule well" as public duties. Concerning the latter, Alexander Campbell wrote:

> "*To rule well* is one of the most difficult attainments. It calls for meekness, candor, firmness, courage, patience, and indefatigable attention to the first indication of remissness or delinquency. So peculiar is the assemblage of attributes requisite to ruling well, that they are more rarely to be met with than the gifts of eloquence and the highest didactic powers."[49]

Disciples considered the private duties as very important, and regarded private reproofs, corrections, and instructions as frequently much better than public. With regard to the deacon, Campbell wrote:

> "The deacon, as the name imports, is the minister or servant of the congregation. He is the steward, the treasurer, the almoner of the church. The *seven* chosen and ordained in the congregation of Jerusalem were set over the business of supplying the tables of the poor saints and widows. They are a standing institution in the Christian house of God. It was anciently the custom to commit to the deacons' care the Lord's table, the bishop's table, and the tables of the poor. From all that is said of their office in the

[48] 1 *Timothy* 3: 1-13.
[49] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 126.

Epistles, and of their qualifications, they must be regarded as were the deacons in the synagogues—the public servants of the church in all things pertaining to its internal and external relations—in all matters of temporal concern.''[50]

Alexander Campbell naturally left the time and order of church worship to the determination of the individual churches. He said:

''But at what hour of the day, and in what sort of a house, and how often on the Lord's day the church should assemble; and whether she should first pray, sing or read the Living Oracles; and at what period of her worship she should do this, or that, are matters left to the discretion of the brotherhood, and to that expediency which a thousand contingencies in human lot and circumstance must suggest, and for which no unchangeable ritual or formulary could possibly have been instituted. The Jews' religion was given and adapted to one nation, whose temple was fixed in Jerusalem; but Christianity is designed for all nations, and is adapted to all varieties of human circumstances, from east to west, and from pole to pole.''[51]

Campbell had very definite ideas, however, with regard to many things. He preferred kneeling in prayer if he could make it convenient. He declared that the Scriptures should always be read with all possible ''accuracy, distinctness, emphasis, and solemnity.''[52] He had very severe words for the late arrivals and the early leavers:

''Next to those who permit barking and fighting dogs and screaming children to torment the audience, I know of

---

[50] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 127.
[51] *Ibid.*, II., 129.
[52] *Ibid.*, II., 130.

none more obnoxious to censure than those disturbers of the peace, who are ever and anon on foot, going out and coming in, as if to arrest attention, or disturb the speaker and the audience. Such persons have as little respect for the credit of their parents and tutors as they have for their own reputation, and ought to be publicly reproved by every good bishop.''[53]

Although Campbell did declare that the method of voting should be a matter of expediency, he had definite opinions as to when and for what purposes Christians should be authorized to vote. He wrote:

''They are not to vote on questions of faith, piety, or morality. Truth is not to be settled by a vote, nor is any divine institution, respecting the worship or morality of the Christian church, to be decided by a majority. These are matters of revelation, of divine authority, and to be regulated by a 'thus saith the Lord,' and not by a 'thus saith the majority.' But in all matters not of faith, piety, or morality; in all matters of expediency, and sometimes in questions of fact pertaining to cases of discipline, there is no other way of deciding but by vote of the brotherhood. There is no revelation that A, B, or C shall be chosen elders or deacons; that D, E, or F shall be sent on any special message; that the church shall meet in any given place at any given hour, or that this or that measure is to be adopted in reference to any particular duty arising out of the internal or external relations of the church. Such matters are to be decided by the vote of the whole community, or not at all.''[54]

As other religious bodies view the matter, one of the peculiarities of the Disciples of Christ is

[53] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 131.
[54] *Ibid.*, II., 132, 133.

their distinction between the Sabbath and the Lord's Day. Disciples think that the Sabbath was abrogated with the Mosaic law, and that its observance is not binding upon Christians. In support of this position, they quote such passages as *Galatians* 3:24, 25: "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we may be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster," and *Colossians* 2:13-17:

"And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses; Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."

They insist that the Sabbath was the seventh day of the week, and a day of rest, whereas the Lord's Day is the first day of the week and a day of spiritual activity. They contend that Christians everywhere should celebrate this day, for:

1. Christ rose from the dead on the first day of the week.

2. The Holy Spirit was poured out upon the Disciples on the first day of the week—the day of Pentecost.

3. Remission of sins and resurrection from the dead in the name of Christ were first proclaimed on this day.

4. The early Disciples came together to break bread on the first day of the week.[55]

The above reasons are considered as binding upon all Christians, and practically all observe the first day of the week, but other bodies frequently apply the term *Sabbath* to the first day. This, the Disciples regard as a most egregious blunder. Alexander Campbell advanced the following reasons why the men of the world as well as professing Christians should observe the first day of the week:

1. There is nothing more "lovely" or of "better report" than a strict observance of the first day of the week by those who fear God; hence it is obligatory, according to *Philippians* 4:8.

2. It is a benevolent provision calculated to give a respite from toil to man and beast.

3. The cause of good order, good morals, and practical godliness is greatly advanced thereby.

4. People of all classes thereby have an opportunity of reading the Bible and teaching it to their children.

5. It is necessary to preserve the worship of God, the preaching of the Gospel, and the moral and religious instruction of the world.

6. Nearly always the Christians who excel in a due observance of the first day of the week are first

[55] They lay much stress on this passage—*Acts* 20:7.

in all good works, and the most conscientious and devout in the service of God.[56]

The most vexing of problems, the Trinity, has bothered the Disciples little. Alexander Campbell seldom wrote on the question; when he did write, it was under protest. Under such a condition, he gave an exposition of *John* 1:1: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Campbell said:

"As a word is an exact image of an idea, so is 'The Word' an exact image of the invisible God. As a word can not exist without an idea, nor an idea without a word, so God never was without 'The Word,' nor 'The Word' without God, or as a word is of equal age, or coetaneous with its idea, so 'The Word' and God are co-eternal. And as an idea does not create its word, nor a word its idea; so God did not create 'The Word,' nor the 'Word' God.

"Such a view does the language used by John suggest. And to this do all the scriptures agree. For 'The Word' was made flesh, and in consequence of becoming incarnate, he is styled the Son of God, the only Begotten of the Father. As from eternity God was manifest in and by 'The Word,' so now God is manifest in the flesh. As God was always with 'The Word,' so when 'The Word' becomes flesh, he is Emanuel, God with us. As God was never manifest but by 'The Word,' so the heavens and the earth, and all things, were created by 'The Word.' And as 'The Word' ever was the effulgence or representation of the invisible God, so he will ever be known and adored as 'The Word of God.'"[57]

Barton W. Stone questioned some of Campbell's views. In the form of an interrogation, he stated:

[56] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 155.
[57] The *Christian Baptist*, May 7, 1827.

"That the Word (di'hou) by whom all things were made, was not the only true God, but a person that existed with the only true God before creation began; not from eternity, else he must be the only true God; but long before the reign of Augustus Cæsar."[58] Campbell replied at once, and among other things said:

"But, Brother Stone, I exceedingly regret that you have said and written so much on two topics, neither of which you, nor myself, nor any man living, can fully understand. One of these is the burthen of your late letter to me. You do not like my comment on John, Ch. 1, ver. 1st.—Well, then, just say so, and let it alone. I said in presenting it I was not about to contend for it, nor to maintain any theory upon the subject. My words are, 'Nor would I dispute, or contend for this as a theory or speculation with anybody.' Why, then, call me into the field?"[59]

Towards the conclusion of his answer, he wrote:

"But I adopt neither system, and will fight for none. I believe that God so loved the world that he sent his only begotten Son; that Jesus was the Son of God, in the true, full, and proper import of these words; that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, which was sent by the concurrence of the Father and the Son to attest and establish the truth, and remain a comforter, an advocate on earth, when Jesus entered the heavens. If any man's faith in this matter is stronger or greater than mine, I have no objection. I only request him not to despise my weakness, and I will not condemn his strength."[60]

---

[58] The *Christian Baptist*, October 1, 1827.
[59] *Ibid.*, October 1, 1827.
[60] *Ibid.*, October 1, 1827.

The popular slogan of the "Reformation" movement was: "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent."[61] Disciples still believe in granting freedom of opinion[62] in non-essentials, but they stand firmly for two things which all Protestant religious bodies do not accept; namely, immersion and the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper, and, in spite of their desire for Christian unity based on the Bible alone, they will not yield on these two points, which are pre-eminently the distinguishing characteristics of the Disciples of Christ. The man who, more than any other human person, shaped their teaching was Alexander Campbell. His doctrines, as summarized by a personal acquaintance and the greatest editor of the Disciples, Isaac Errett, will be given in review:

---

[61] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 352.

[62] They define opinions as inferences of human reason with regard to things not actually considered in the Bible (*Millennial Harbinger,* II., 331). The severest test came in the case of Aylett Raines, a gifted young minister of the Western Reserve. Raines held "Restorationist" opinions, which he frequently preached; many ministers opposed him for this reason. Both Campbells, however, favored him. The older preached to the association on the text, "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations;" or in Thompson's new version, "without regard to differences of opinion." The younger defined again the difference between faith and opinion, and stated that Mr. Raines' views on the restoration of the wicked after they had undergone a certain amount of punishment was only an opinion, for there was not a single passage in the Bible affirming it. Campbell then asked Raines to express his willingness to preach the Gospel as the apostles preached it, and to retain his opinions as private property. Raines agreed; consequently a large majority of the association decided that he did not merit condemnation (see Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* I., 244-246).

"Christ, the only master; involving a rejection of all human names and leaderships in religion. The Bible, the only authoritative Book; necessitating a denial of the authority of all human creeds. The Church of Christ, as founded by Him, and built by the apostles for a habitation of God through the Spirit, the only institution for spiritual ends; logically leading to the repudiation of all sect religions as unscriptural and dishonoring to the Head of the Church. Faith in Jesus, as the Christ, the Son of God, and repentance towards God, the only prerequisites to baptism and consequent church membership; thus dismissing all doctrinal speculation and all theological dogmata, whether true or false, as unworthy to be urged as tests of fitness for membership in the Church of Christ. Obedience to the divine commandments, and not correctness of opinion, the test of Christian standing. The Gospel the essential channel of spiritual influence in conversion; thus ignoring all reliance on abstract and immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, and calling the attention of inquirers away from dreams, visions, and impressions, which are so liable to deceive the living and powerful truths of the Gospel, which are reliable, immutable and eternal. The truth of the Gospel, to enlighten; the love of God in the Gospel, to persuade; the ordinances of the Gospel, as tests of submission to the divine will; the promises of the Gospel, as the evidences of pardon and acceptance; and the Holy Spirit, in and through all these, accomplishing His work of enlightening, convincing of sin, guiding the penitent soul to pardon, and bearing witness to the obedient believer of His adoption into the family of God."[63]

---

[63] Quoted by McLean, A. *Alexander Campbell as a Preacher*, 38-40.

VIII

METHODS OF WORK

VARIOUS ways were used to spread the teaching of the Reformers. The most prominent were by preaching, by debates, by means of the press, by educational work, and by missionary activities.

Of course, one of the most successful methods of spreading religious teaching is by preaching. The Reformers were favored greatly by having or developing a set of able ministers. The Campbells and their immediate followers, with the exception of Walter Scott and a few others, were not great evangelists at first, but with the Kentucky union, the evangelistic ardor of Stone's followers began to permeate the whole mass. Consequently, great numbers were added to the Disciples or "Christians." Most of the great leaders have already been mentioned. A few more will be given, but many deserving of mention will have to be omitted.[1] One

[1] Some of the greatest leaders about 1830 were: Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, Walter Scott, Robert Richardson, Philip S. Fall, William Hayden, Adamson Bentley, Cyrus Bosworth, Marcus Bosworth, John Smith, D. S. Burnett, James Challen, John Henry, Jacob Osborne, Sidney Rigdon, A. J. Ewing, Darwin Atwater, Aylett Raines, Jacob Creath, Sr., Jacob Creath, Jr., John T. Johnson, Barton W. Stone, Samuel Rogers, John Rogers, John A. Gano, John Whitaker, John Flick, Joseph Gaston, Thomas M. Allen, John Secrist and B. F. Hall.

who deserves especial mention is William Hayden. During a ministry of thirty-five years he traveled 90,000 miles, 60,000 of which were made on horseback, baptized over 1,200 people with his own hands, and preached over 9,000 sermons, or about 260 per year. His power of winning people was very great, whether in private or public talk, for he was a charming conversationalist and an effective speaker.[1] Many of the ministers liked to go out two by two. Hayden and Walter Scott, the former as singer and the latter as preacher, often went out together. Scott declared that with his Bible, his head, and William Hayden he could convert the world.[2]

John Henry and Thomas Campbell were two others who traveled much together in Ohio. Both were very successful ministers, and both possessed a keen appreciation of humor. One evening Campbell announced at the close of his sermon that his friend John Henry would preach the next evening. He warned the audience that they had better bring their buckets along, "as the flood-gates of the Gospel" would be opened by his distinguished brother. Henry did not exactly relish this reference to his rapid speaking, and since Campbell was noted for his slow, deliberate speech, he determined to get even. He did, for at the close of his service he announced that Father Campbell would preach the next evening, and he advised the audience to come

[1] Moore, W. T. *Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ*, 282, 283.

[2] McLean, A. *Thomas and Alexander Campbell*, 34.

prepared for a long siege, with enough food to satisfy their hunger, "as the everlasting Gospel would be preached."[4]

One of the most popular and effective Baptist preachers in Kentucky—John Smith—united with the Reformers. He said to his wife one day, as he was summing up the results of a few months' work in 1828: "Nancy, I have *baptized* seven hundred sinners and *capsized* fifteen hundred Baptists."[5] He was so successful in the work of capsizing in the North District Baptist Association that when the division came, eighteen out of the twenty-six churches composing it stood on the side of the "Reformation." The following incident shows his dramatic and convincing methods. A minister of the Methodist Church had been seen to baptize a struggling, crying infant in the place where Smith was holding a meeting. The next day this minister came to watch Smith baptize some converts. The latter saw the visiting clergyman, walked up to him, seized him by the arm, and drew him towards the water. The following conversation occurred:

"What are you going to do, Mr. Smith?

"I am going to baptize you, sir.

"But I do not wish to be baptized.

"Do you not believe?

"Certainly I do.

"Then come along, sir, believers must be baptized.

---

[4] Moore, W. T. *Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ.* 284.

[5] Williams, J. A. *Life of Elder John Smith,* 208.

"But I am not willing to go. It would certainly do me no good to be baptized against my will.

"Did you not, but yesterday, baptize a helpless babe against its will?"

Then turning to the audience, Smith said: "But, friends, let me know if he ever again baptizes others without their full consent; for you yourselves have heard him declare that such a baptism can not possibly do any good."[6]

Alexander Campbell was a wonderful preacher,[7] but in the use of the second method—the debate—he stood without a peer, either among the Reformers or his opponents. He took part in five important public discussions: 1820—with John Walker, a Seceder minister, at Mt. Pleasant, Ohio, on baptism; 1823—with William L. MacCalla, a Presbyterian minister, at Washington, Kentucky, on baptism; 1829—with Robert Owen, a Scotch infidel and socialist, at Cincinnati, Ohio, on the Evidences of Christianity; 1837—with John Purcell, a Roman Catholic bishop, at Cincinnati, Ohio, on "Romanism vs. Protestantism;" 1842—with N. L. Rice, Presbyterian minister, at Lexington, Kentucky, on "The Plea for New Testament Christianity and the Westminster Confession of Faith." In addition to these, he held an informal debate with Obadiah Jennings, a Presbyterian minister, at Nashville, Tennessee, in 1830, and he also conducted in

[6] Williams, J. A. *Life of Elder John Smith*, 189, 190.

[7] A. McLean gives a collection of tributes paid by noted men to Alexander Campbell's ability as a preacher in his *Thomas and Alexander Campbell*, pages 48-50.

the *Harbinger* printed debates in the form of letters and replies. In the latter way, he debated with Humphrey Marshall, of Kentucky, 1832, on "Christian Evidences;" with M. Meredith, of North Carolina, 1836, on "Regeneration;" with D. Skinner, 1837 and 1838, on "Universalism;" and with S. W. Lynd, a Baptist minister, 1837, on the "Converting Power of the Holy Spirit." Campbell also held a discussion with his brethren through the *Harbinger,* in 1853, on the "Relation of Unimmersed Believers to the Christian Church."[8]

Obviously only the briefest reference can be made to a few of these debates. Probably the most important were the MacCalla-Campbell, the Owen-Campbell and the Rice-Campbell debates; hence these will be discussed somewhat in detail. As previously stated, Campbell was a little averse to debating, but his experience with Walker had led him to see the advantages of public discussions; consequently he turned to them with apparent eagerness.

The most striking thing about the MacCalla-Campbell Debate was the importance attached by Campbell to baptism. He had advanced on this subject after his discussion with Walker. Since the question of baptism was perhaps the most significant one in all of his debates, it may be worth while to follow this discussion in some detail. MacCalla argued that in order to produce a divine

[8] *Millennial Harbinger,* II., 443, 444.

command for infant baptism five things had to be done:

1. To prove that Abraham and his descendants formed a divinely constituted, true, and visible Church of God.

2. To prove that the Jewish society before Christ and the Christian society after Christ were the same church in different dispensations, or that the Christian Church is a branch of the Abrahamic Church.

3. To prove that Jewish circumcision, before Christ, and Christian baptism after Christ were one and the same seal, though in different forms.

4. To prove that the giving of this seal to babies was once commanded by Divine authority.

5. To show that since it had not been prohibited by the authority which had ordained it, it remained in force.

If MacCalla had succeeded in establishing these points, Biblical authority for infant baptism would have been deduced. In an effort to do this, he used the following comparison:

Circumcision.	*Baptism.*
"1. Was an initiatory rite, by which the circumcised were owned as of the covenant seed, and of the people of God.	"1. Is an initiatory rite, by which the baptized are numbered among the disciples of Christ, and the members of the Church of God.
"2. Was a seal of the righteousness of faith, Rom. IV. 11; *i. e.*, of the Justification of a sinner through the	"2. The person is baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins

righteousness of a surety embraced by faith.

"3. Was an emblem and a means of internal sanctity. The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live. *Deut.* XXX. 6. See also Ch. X. 16."

(Acts 2: 38) which is through faith in his blood; so that God is just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

"3. Is a sign and means of our sanctification in virtue of our communion with Christ—'Buried with him by baptism into death that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life.'' Rom. V. 1, 4. See also 1 *Peter* III. 21."[9]

In reply, Campbell urged the following points against MacCalla's position on circumcision:

1. Since circumcision was administered to *males only,* its substitute, baptism, should be confined to males only.

2. Since circumcision did not require *faith* in its subject, baptism should not.

3. Inasmuch as circumcision, according to the law, was administered on the eighth day, baptism should be administered on the eighth day.

4. Since circumcision was administered by parents, not by priests *ex officio,* baptism, its substitute, ought likewise to be administered by parents, not by priests, or clergy *ex officio.*

5. Because circumcision was a mark made upon, not the face of the subject, baptism ought not to be performed on the face.

[9] *A Debate on Christian Baptism between the Rev. W. L. MacCalla, a Presbyterian Teacher, and Alexander Campbell,* 219, 220.

6. Circumcision was a duty binding upon the parent, not the child, who was passive; hence baptism is a duty of the parent, and the child is passive.

7. Since circumcision was administered to all a man's slaves, baptism ought to be administered to all the slaves of a householder, as well as to his own seed.

8. Inasmuch as circumcision required neither piety nor faith in the parent to entitle his child to this ordinance, neither faith nor piety should be demanded of parents as necessary to the baptism of their children.

9. Because circumcision implied that its subject was entitled to all the promises made to Abraham concerning his descendants, baptism implies that its subject is entitled to a share in all the earthly blessings promised to Abraham's seed.

10. Since circumcision was a sign in the flesh of the Abrahamic covenant (*Genesis* 17), baptism is a sign in the flesh of the same covenant.

11. Because circumcision was not to be performed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, baptism should not be performed in those names.

12. Since circumcision was identified with the law of Moses (*John* 7:23), and shared a similar fate, baptism is identified with the law of Moses, and will share the same fate.

13. If circumcision has come to such a condition that Christ does not profit the circumcised, baptism,

its substitute, will or has come to such a crisis that Christ does not profit the baptized.

14. If circumcision did not exempt a single Jew from baptism when he believed in Christ, its substitute, baptism, should not exempt a believer from being baptized time after time.[10]

In replying to the question of household baptisms, Campbell's treatment of Lydia's family was typical. Before positive proof could be deduced from the Bible for infant baptism, the following facts, he held, had to be established:

1. That Lydia had ever married.
2. That she had married lately.
3. That she had children.
4. That she brought her children with her from Thyatira to Philippi, a journey of two hundred miles, largely by sea.
5. That her children were infants at that time.
6. That they were ever actually baptized.

In summing up, he declared: "Indeed there is not *probable* evidence, much less *positive* evidence of infant baptism in this family."[11]

In this debate, Campbell proved three points to his own satisfaction. In the first place, he showed that a believer was the only subject for baptism, because:

1. The law of baptism authorized the baptism of believers only, and in fact forbade the baptism of any others.

---

[10] MacCalla-Campbell *Debate*, 219, 220.
[11] *Ibid.*, 263.

2. The apostles in carrying out their commission in "Jerusalem, Judæa, Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth" never baptized any other than a professed believer.

3. The nature and design of baptism were adapted to believers only.

4. The promises connected with baptism were addressed to believers only.

5. The actions of the baptized, before and after their obedience, as recorded in the New Testament were of such a nature that infants could not have performed them.

Campbell, in the second place, attempted to show that immersion was the only baptism. In order to do this, he brought authorities to prove that:

1. The Greek verbs and verbal nouns used in the New Testament were of definite import, naturally or literally denoting the act of immersion, and "were so understood by all translators, critics, and lexicographers of candor and eminence."

2. The prepositions used with those terms required them to be translated "immerse" or "dip."

3. The doctrinal references to the action of baptism indicated immersion and represented the person as immersed.

4. The places and circumstances connected with the action proved that it was immersion.

5. All church historians, ancient writers, and the most learned Paido Baptists declared that immersion was the primitive practice.

In the last place, Campbell argued that infant sprinkling was harmful to the "well being of society, religious and political," for:

1. It was "evil in itself."
2. It was an "act of will worship."
3. It "carnalized" and "secularized" the church.
4. It was a deceit practiced on the child.
5. It increased superstitions in the parents.
6. It helped introduce a worldly priesthood into the church.
7. It often led to persecutions and thereby brought calamities on the state.
8. It was highly divisive, and presented "the greatest obstacle to the union of Christians."[12]

An amusing incident took place on the last day of this debate. MacCalla had spoken of the dangers of immersion both to the subject and the administrator. In reply, Campbell recounted a story told of Franklin when the latter was dining at Paris with a number of French and American gentlemen. At dinner a learned French abbe gave a lengthy disquisition on the harmful influence of the American climate upon the bodies of all animals, declaring that the body diminished in size and energy, and that the mind itself shared in the deterioration. Franklin made no reply at the time, but after dinner, he moved that the company be divided, all Americans going on one side of the room and all

[12] For Campbell's own recapitulation of his method of attack, see the MacCalla-Campbell *Debate*, 390, 391.

the French on the other, as the fairest way of testing the theory. The motion was carried. The Frenchmen proved to be pygmies; the Americans, little giants. Turning to the abbe, Franklin said: "Ay, see, here is striking proof of the correctness of your theory."[13] In making the application, Campbell said:

"Now let us take the philosopher's way of testing the correctness of the theory of my opponent. There sits on the bench a Baptist and a Pædobaptist teacher, both well advanced in years; the former has, we are told, immersed more persons than any other person of the same age in the United States; the other, from his venerable age, may be supposed to have sprinkled a great many infants. Now, see the pernicious tendency of immersion on the Baptist, and the happy influence of sprinkling on the Pædobaptist."[14]

The audience was convulsed with laughter, for Mr. Birch, the Presbyterian moderator, was a small, sickly looking person, while Bishop Vardeman, the Baptist moderator, was over six feet tall, weighed more than three hundred pounds, and was splendidly formed and of a very florid aspect.[15]

Possibly the most important debate in which Campbell was engaged was the one with Robert Owen, the Scotch reformer and infidel. In this debate, he appeared as the defender of Christianity, not of his own particular beliefs. Owen had issued an open challenge, meant particularly for the clergy

[13] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 85.
[14] *Ibid.*, II., 85.
[15] *Ibid.*, II., 85.

of New Orleans, in which city he had lectured. His challenge read:

"I propose to prove, as I have already attempted to do in my lectures, that all the religions of the world have been founded on the ignorance of mankind; that they are directly opposed to the never changing laws of our nature; that they have been and are the real source of vice, disunion and misery of every description; that they are now the only real bar to the formation of a society of virtue, of intelligence, of charity in its most extended sense, and of sincerity and kindness among the whole human family; and that they can be no longer maintained except through the ignorance of the mass of the people, and the tyranny of the few over that mass."[16]

Since no one else seemed willing to accept the challenge, Campbell did, and the debate took place in the Methodist Church at Cincinnati, April 13-21, 1829.[17] Owen advanced twelve so called fundamental laws to which he stuck closely in spite of their irrelevance to the subject under discussion. They were:

"1. That man, at his birth, has been made ignorant of everything relative to his own organization and he has not been permitted to create any part of the propensities, faculties, and qualities, physical or mental, which have been given to him, or which he possesses.

"2. That no two infants have yet been known to possess precisely the same organization at birth, and the differences between all infants are formed by a power unknown to them.

"3. That each individual is placed, at birth, without his consent or knowledge, under circumstances, which, acting

[16] The *Christian Baptist*, May 5, 1828.

[17] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 269.

upon his peculiar organization, impress the general character of those circumstances upon the infant, child and man; the influence of those circumstances being modified, in some degree, by the peculiar natural organization of each individual.

"4. That no individual has had the power of deciding at what period of time, or in what part of the world, he shall come into existence, of whom he shall be born; what district religion he shall be trained to believe, or by what other circumstances he shall be surrounded from birth to death.

"5. That each individual is so organized, that, when young, he may be made to receive impressions from those around him, which shall produce either true ideas or false notions, and beneficial or injurious habits, and to retain them with great tenacity.

"6. That each individual is so organized, that he must believe according to the strongest impressions that shall be made on his feelings; while his belief in no case depends upon his will.

"7. That each individual is so created, that he must like that which is pleasant to him, or that which produces agreeable sensations on his individual organization, and he must dislike that which creates in him unpleasant or disagreeable sensations; while he cannot discover, previous to experience what these sensations shall be.

"8. That each individual is so created, that the sensations made upon his organization, although pleasant or delightful at their commencement, become, when continued without intermission beyond a certain period, disagreeable and painful; while, on the contrary, when a too rapid change of sensations is made on his organization, it dissipates, weakens, and otherwise injures his physical, intellectual, and moral powers and enjoyments.

"9. That the highest health, the greatest progressive improvement, and most permanent happiness of each individual depend, in a great degree, upon the proper cultivation of all his faculties, physical and mental, from infancy

to maturity, and upon all these parts of his nature being duly called into action, at their proper period, and temperately exercised according to the strength and capacity of the individual.

"10. That the individual is made to possess and acquire the *worst* character, when his organization at birth has been composed of the most inferior ingredients, or natural qualities of our common nature, and, when he has been so organized, that he has been placed from birth to death amidst the most *vicious* or *worst* circumstances.

"11. That the individual is made to possess and acquire a *medium* character, when his original organization has been called *superior*, but the circumstances which surround him from birth to death produce continued *unfavorable* impressions. Or when his organization has been formed of inferior propensities, faculties, and qualities, and the circumstances in which he has been placed from birth to death are of a character to produce superior impressions only. Or when there has been some mixture of *superior* and *inferior* qualities in the original organization, when it has been placed through life in various circumstances of good and evil. Hitherto this has been the common lot of mankind.

"12. That the individual is made the most superior of his species when his original organization has been compounded of the best proportions of the best ingredients of which human nature is formed, and when the circumstances which surround him during life produce only superior impressions. In other words, when his organization is the most perfect, and the laws, institutions, and practices which surround him are all in unison with his nature."[18]

Owen read from his manuscript; Campbell usually spoke extemporaneously. The only speech which the latter wrote out was the first. In this he pictured the early struggles of Christianity, its

[18] Owen-Campbell *Debate*, or *Evidences of Christianity*, 113, 114.

triumphs over the nations by means of its evidences, and its divine principles of self denial, humility, patience, and courage. He dwelt also upon the love, purity, peace, joy, and hopes which Christianity imparted, and contrasted these with the rewards of disbelief, sensual indulgence, and eternal death. He pointed out from time to time the futility of Owen's "no praise, no blame scheme," and proved that all the benevolent features of the plan were plagiarisms from the Bible. He declared, moreover, that Owen could derive no solace from his New Harmony project. His best and most complete speech in favor of Christianity took seven hours for its delivery. At the close of the debate, he asked all who believed in the truth of the Christian religion or felt so much interest in it as to wish to see it prevail to rise. Practically all of the audience rose. Campbell continued, "Now, I would further propose *that all persons doubtful of the truth of the Christian religion* or who do not believe it, and who are not friendly to its spread and prevalence over the world, will please signify it by rising up." Only three persons rose.[19]

Mrs. Trollope, author of *Domestic Manners of the Americans,* was present. She spoke of Owen's gentle tone, his affectionate interest for "the whole human family," his air of candour, his kind smile, the mild expression of his eyes. "Never did any

[19] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 282. The debate was largely attended, and many people were turned away from the house, which would seat only twelve hundred.

one," wrote Mrs. Trollope, "practice the *suaviter in modo* with more powerful effect than Mr. Owen."[20] In referring to his opponent, she said:

"Mr. Campbell then arose; his person, voice and manner all greatly in his favor. In his first attack he used the arms, which in general have been considered as belonging to the other side of the question. He quizzed Mr. Owen most unmercifully; pinched him here for his parallelograms; hit him there for his human perfectibility, and kept the whole audience in a roar of laughter. Mr. Owen joined in most heartily himself, and listened to him throughout with the air of a man who is delighted at the good things he is hearing, and exactly in the cue to enjoy all the other good things which he is sure will follow. Mr. Campbell's watch was the only one which reminded us that we had listened to him for half an hour; and having continued speaking for a few minutes after he had looked at it, he sat down with, I should think, the universal admiration of his auditory."[21]

With regard to Owen's "twelve fundamental laws of human nature," the same writer declared:

"To me they appear twelve truisms, that no man in his senses would ever think of contradicting; but how any one can have conceived that the explanation and defence of these laws could furnish forth occupation for his pen and his voice, through whole years of unwearying declamation, or how he can have dreamed that they could be twisted into a refutation of the Christian religion, is a mystery which I never expect to understand."[22]

After referring to Owen's entrenching himself behind his twelve laws, and Campbell's extensive

[20] *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, I., 207.
[21] *Ibid.*, I., 208, 209.
[22] *Ibid.*, I., 209.

use of theological authorities, Mrs. Trollope continued:

"Neither appeared to answer the other; but to confine themselves to the utterance of what they had uppermost in their own minds when the discussion began. I lamented this on the side of Mr. Campbell, as I am persuaded he would have been much more powerful had he trusted more to himself and less to his books. Mr. Owen is an extraordinary man, and certainly possessed of talent, but he appears to me so utterly benighted in the mist of his own theories, that he has quite lost the power of looking through them, so as to get a peep at the world as it really exists around him. . . ."[23]

Fifteen different meetings were held, but when the debate was over, the number of Christians and infidels in Cincinnati was said to be the same as the number previous to the discussion. In concluding her account, Mrs. Trollope expressed surprise that both debaters always kept their temper, and that they often dined together. "All this I think," said she, "could only have happened in America. I am not quite sure that it was very desirable it should have happened anywhere."[24]

The last important debate in which Alexander Campbell engaged was the one with N. L. Rice at Lexington, Kentucky. This debate began Wednesday, November 15, 1843, and lasted sixteen days. Since the preliminary correspondence and debate make a volume of nine hundred and twelve closely

[23] *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, I., 210.
[24] *Ibid.*, I., 211, 212.

printed octavo pages, and since, moreover, much of the material would be a repetition of things already stated, the debate will not be considered in detail here. Campbell's method was to grasp the big fundamental principles; Rice's, to take the details. The former sought to establish principles; the latter tried to overthrow them by bringing in exceptions.[25] The following propositions were discussed:

"I. The immersion in water of a proper subject into the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is the one only apostolic or Christian baptism: *Mr. C. affirms.*

"II. The infant of a believing parent is a scriptural subject of baptism: *Mr. R. affirms.*

"III. Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins: *Mr. C. affirms.*

"IV. Baptism is to be administered only by a bishop or ordained presbyter: *Mr. R. affirms.*

"V. In conversion and sanctification the Spirit of God operates on persons only through the Word of truth: *Mr. C. affirms.*

"VI. Human creeds, as bonds of union and communion, are necessarily heretical and schismatical: *Mr. C. affirms.*" [26]

During the course of the debate, Rice had gathered on his table a large number of works written by Campbell. These he was fond of quoting, if possible, in such a way as to make their author appear inconsistent. Feeling ran very high at times, and occasionally gave rise to amusing incidents. Two ladies in the gallery were overheard discussing the merits of their respective debaters.

[25] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 503-505.
[26] *Ibid.,* II., 502.

One said to the other as a closing and convincing argument: "You can easily see that Mr. Rice is by far the most learned man. Just see how many books he has upon his table, while Mr. Campbell has hardly any."[27] "But you don't appear to know," retorted the other, "that the books on Mr. Rice's table were *written* by Mr. Campbell."[28]

Perhaps the importance attached to this debate can best be ascertained by pointing out that Henry Clay presided. Clay was a warm admirer of Alexander Campbell. This admiration was based in part at least upon Campbell's opening address on the influence of the Holy Spirit, which is still deservedly admired for its beauty of diction. The presiding officer, who had been hitherto careful to avoid the appearance of favoring either disputant, was completely carried away. Soon after Campbell commenced, Clay became unusually attentive, then he leaned forward, and began to bow assent, waving his hand in his graceful approving manner. Suddenly, however, he remembered his duties as presiding officer, and, with a start, looked around to see if any one had noticed him off his guard.[29]

---

[27] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 511.

[28] *Ibid.*, II., 511.

[29] *Ibid.*, II., 513, 514.

This good opinion of the debater continued, for later, just before Campbell went abroad, Clay, who, like many others, thought that the minister was a doctor of divinity and misunderstood his position in other respects, sent him the following letter:

"The Rev. Dr. A. Campbell, the bearer hereof, a citizen of the United States of America, residing in the Commonwealth of Virginia, being about to make a voyage to Europe and to travel particularly in Great Britain, Ireland and France, I take great satisfaction in

As is usual in most cases, both sides claimed the victory in debate. Rice certainly displayed a readiness in reply, and an ingenuity and a plausibility in argument beyond the public expectation, but his friends overlooked the fact that a boastful and supercilious manner could not be transferred to print as could argumentative speeches. One of these admirers, a Mr. J. H. Brown, eagerly purchased the copyright of the printed debate for $2000. The Presbyterians soon found, however, that their earnest efforts to circulate the book made many converts to Campbell's views, but none to Presbyterianism; hence the copyright was sold to C. D. Roberts, a member of the Christian Church at Jacksonville, Illinois. A large edition was at once printed and circulated by the Disciples.[80]

[80] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 527.

strongly recommending him to the kind offices and friendly reception and treatment of all persons with whom he may meet and wherever he may go. Dr. Campbell is among the most eminent citizens of the United States, distinguished for his great learning and ability, for his successful devotion to the education of youth, for his piety and as the head and founder of one of the most important and respectable religious communities in the United States. Nor have his great talents been exclusively confined to the religious and literary walks in which he has principally moved; he was a distinguished member, about twenty years ago, of the convention called in the State of Virginia to remodel its civil constitution, in which besides other eminent men, were ex-Presidents Madison and Monroe, and John Marshall, the late Chief Justice of the United States.

"Dr. Campbell, whom I have the honor to regard personally as my friend, carries with him my wishes and my prayers for his health and happiness whilst abroad, and for his safe return to his country, which justly appreciates him so highly. H. CLAY.

"ASHLAND, Kentucky, May, 1847."

(Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 548).

Among the converts made to the new organization by the Rice-Campbell *Debate* were members of all churches, including Archibald Campbell, an uncle of the second debater and an elder of the Presbyterian Church in Newry, Ireland.[21] This result should have been foreseen, because during the discussion, when Campbell preached, a number came forward for baptism, among them an intelligent Lutheran minister by the name of William McChesney. This minister afterwards gave Campbell the following account:

"I could have sprinkled a child the day before the debate commenced with a good conscience. All my early education and associations were placed on a scale with Pædobaptism during the debate. I went there willing to ascertain the truth. I was a little prejudiced against you and more than a little against the Reformation. I listened with candor and attention. After the whole ground had been gone over, I was satisfied that nothing but immersion would do and that infant baptism could not be maintained from the Scriptures. I felt deeply interested in the whole matter. If Mr. Rice could have met all your arguments satisfactorily to my mind, he would have received my warmest thanks. He failed, however, in my estimation—completely failed in both."[22]

There has been and probably always will be a difference of opinion with regard to the effectiveness of debates in spreading the "Reformation" plea. One of the greatest historians among the Disciples, W. T. Moore, said that the general influence of the

[21] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 525-527.
[22] *Ibid.*, II., 525.

Rice-Campbell *Debate,* as well as of others held during the period, was to draw the lines more clearly between the Reformers, and the members of other churches. Moore listed the following evils of the debating period:

1. Debates were often about things not made conditions of fellowship.

2. They had the tendency of creating a spirit of legalism by emphasizing the "letter" and detracting from the "spirit."

3. They usually magnified the *system* of Christianity rather than the *author* of the system.

4. Although the debates were intended to help bring about Christian union, they often had the opposite effect by emphasizing a party spirit.

5. The debates also frequently had a harmful effect upon the peace and unity of neighborhoods.

6. They were usually contests for party victory in a greater degree than they were for the triumph of the truth.

7. They usually ended with a victory proclaimed for each side, rather than with a victory proclaimed for the truth.[33]

In spite, however, of questionable results which must be admitted to a certain extent, the good outweighed the evil. After the Owen-Campbell *Debate,* in which the latter was acknowledged champion of Christianity, and the Purcell-Campbell *Debate,* in which he was the champion of Protestantism, per-

[33] *Comprehensive History of the Disciples,* 406-409.

secution and opposition began to diminish. The Presbyterians of Kentucky had desired Dr. R. J. Breckenridge, who for twenty-five years had been one of the outstanding figures in the Presbyterian Church, to debate with Campbell and had asked him to do so, but he replied: "No, sir, I will never be Alexander Campbell's opponent. A man who has done what he has to defend Christianity against infidelity, and to defend Protestantism against the delusions and usurpations of Catholicism, I will never oppose in public debate. I esteem him too highly."[84]

Although the early debates were too bitter, they nevertheless made converts to the Reformers in the delivery and also when printed. Samuel Rogers wrote of a school teacher named Wentworth Roberts, who, without making any impression upon his mind, had demanded and obtained from him in 1821, baptism for the remission of sins.[85] During a preaching tour, in the spring of 1826, however, while visiting a Mr. Guess, on Line Creek, near the border of Tennessee and Kentucky, Rogers happened to pick up a copy of the MacCalla-Campbell *Debate*. He told the result thus:

"Turning the leaves slowly over, my eye caught Mr. Campbell's speech on the design of baptism. I read it carefully from beginning to end; and I had scarcely concluded his masterly argument on that subject when I sprang to my feet, dropped the book on the floor, clapped my hands re-

[84] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 450, 451.

[85] *Autobiography of Elder Samuel Rogers*, 55. See page 105.

peatedly together, and exclaimed 'Eureka! Eureka! I have found it! I have found it!' And, thanks be to God, I had found it! I had found the keystone of the arch. It had been lost a long time. I had never seen it before—strange that I had not. But I had seen the vacant space in the arch a hundred times, and I had some idea of the size and shape of it; and when I saw baptism as Mr. Campbell had presented it, I knew it would exactly fit and fill the vacant space. I was converted over; and was one of the happiest young converts you ever saw; happier than when I was converted the first time, and a great deal more certain that I was right. Hitherto, I had been walking in the mud, or on the sand, and withal, groping in the dark. Now, all was light around me, and I felt that I was standing on a rock; and I have felt the same ever since. From that day to this, I have never doubted that baptism is for the remission of sins. Not even a stray doubt has ever flitted across my mind. . . .''[86]

Campbell himself always thought that the victory rested on his side in these debates. Thus, when the Presbyterians were boasting about their success in the Rice-Campbell *Debate*, he published the following:

''An occurrence in Nashville sets this argument in a fair light. I once had a public talk there with the late Obadiah Jennings, D.D., which Presbyterians manufactured into a great debate—in which, of course, I was as usual, gloriously defeated. The city rang with Presbyterian acclamation for some ten days; when an aged citizen accosted one of the boasters in the following style: 'You Presbyterians have gained, you say, a glorious victory. How do you know when you gain a victory? I do not understand how you ascertin a victory. Do tell me how you know when

[86] *Autobiography of Elder Samuel Rogers*, 59.

you beat. I will tell you how in old times we counted victories when I was engaged in the Indian wars. After the battle was over we counted the scalps. Those were said to have conquered who could count the largest number of scalps taken from the enemy. Now since Mr. Campbell has been here, he has immersed some thirty, amongst whom were the most intelligent citizens of Nashville. How many have you added to your church by this debate?' 'I have not heard of any,' said his Presbyterian friend. 'Pray, then, my dear sir, tell me how you know when you have gained a great victory.'"[87]

Colonel Thomas H. Nelson, a former United States minister to Mexico and afterwards to Chile, declared at Terre Haute, in 1888:

"I was a young lawyer at Lexington, Ky., and attended the Campbell-Rice debate. I was a Presbyterian. When I heard the debate I thought Mr. Rice got the better of Mr. Campbell; I purchased the debate when published, and have long since decided that Mr. Campbell was a giant beside the ordinary Mr. Rice. Even now, whenever I want an intellectual stimulus, I take down 'The Campbell-Rice Debate,' and read Mr. Campbell's masterful arguments."[88]

Unrecorded influences, moreover, must have been exercised, for the debates were attended by ministers of all denominations and by people from all over the country.[89] The effect on Campbell's oppo-

[87] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 447.

[88] *Ibid.*, II., 451.

[89] Henry Clay, it has been often said, was immersed after the Rice-Campbell *Debate*, but the better opinion seems to be otherwise. According to T. H. Clay, grandson of the great statesman, Clay was baptized into the Episcopal Church in his parlor at Ashland, June 22, 1847, with water applied by hand out of a large cut glass urn (see Clay, T. H., *Henry Clay*, 413, and also Colton, Calvin, *Last Seven Years of the Life of Henry Clay*, 52-54).

nents was noticeable. Every one of his Presbyterian adversaries was honored with a title. Bishop Purcell of the Catholic church was made an archbishop. Concerning these degrees, Campbell wrote: "We are always pleased and feel ourselves honored by the theological promotion of our opponent."[40]

A third means of spreading the doctrines was by the press. The *Christian Baptist,* 1823-1830, probably created a greater stir than any other work of the same general character. It was intensely iconoclastic as might be judged from the original dedication:

"*To all those,* without distinction, who acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be a Revelation from God; and the New Testament as containing the Religion of *Jesus Christ.*

"Who, willing to have all religious tenets and practices tried by the *Divine Word;* and who feeling themselves in duty bound to search the Scriptures for themselves, in matters of Religion, are disposed to reject all doctrines and commandments of men, to obey the truth, hold fast the faith once delivered to the Saints—this work is most respectfully and affectionately dedicated by The Editor."[41]

The new paper dealt with all kinds of doctrinal questions, and with matters of a historical nature. It was, however, primarily destructive; hence it aroused opposition, and many good Baptists, who had subscribed to the publication, ordered their subscription discontinued. Thus, one man wrote in

[40] *Millennial Harbinger,* II., 451.
[41] Dedication page of the *Christian Baptist,* August 3, 1823.

1823: "I request you to send me the *Christian Baptist* no more, my conscience is wounded that I should have subscribed for such a work. It is a religious incendiary and will do a world of mischief."[42] At the close of 1829, Campbell discontinued this paper and began the publication of the *Millennial Harbinger,* a magazine twice as large. After 1836, he was aided in this work by Richardson, and later by Pendleton and others. Campbell continued to edit the new magazine, however, until 1865, but his iconoclastic methods were gradually laid aside, and the publication became constructive in character. The doctrinal teaching of these papers[43] has already been sufficiently indicated by reference to the fact that Baptists were excommunicated for reading them. The papers, nevertheless, were freely circulated, and converts to the views of the new movement were made by the hundreds and thousands. The Baptist ministers of Kentucky were so tolerant of what they found in the early numbers of the *Christian Baptist* that they even helped circulate it. This was probably due, however, to the result of the MacCalla-Campbell *Debate,* and the fact that the Baptists had not yet had time to become thoroughly acquainted with its contents.[44] A paper less influential than the ones edited by Campbell was the *Christian Messenger,* edited by Barton

[42] Gates, E. *The Disciples of Christ,* 121.

[43] The position held in the early period by these two papers was taken in part by the *Christian Standard* when Isaac Errett assumed the editorship in 1866.

[44] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 89.

W. Stone, which was first issued in 1826. After six years John T. Johnson became associate editor. This editorial connection was dissolved in 1834, when Stone moved to Jacksonville, Illinois. The publication of the paper was continued, nevertheless, with some intermissions until 1843 at Jacksonville.[45]

Alexander Campbell's work was not entirely confined to the publication of papers. His version of the New Testament based on the work of George Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge ran through six editions. He published a hymnal, a work on baptism, a volume of popular lectures and addresses, and *The Christian System*. These were the most important, but in all about sixty volumes came from his pen.[46] Prior to the Civil War, few Disciples had published works. Aside from Campbell's writings, the most important book was Walter Scott's *The Messiahship*.[47]

In the early days, as now, many preachers were largely interested in educational work. The four greatest leaders of the "Reformation" movement—Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, Barton W. Stone, and Walter Scott—all spent much time as teachers. In fact, the Campbells were more noted for their teaching ability than for their evangelistic zeal. Both father and son had taught in Ireland, and both taught here. The latter opened Buffalo

[45] Rogers, J. R. *The Cane Ridge Meeting House*, 201.
[46] McLean, A. *Thomas and Alexander Campbell*, 27.
[47] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 415.

Academy in his own home in 1818, but his real educational work did not begin until the founding of Bethany College, which was chartered in January, 1840, and opened in October of the same year with the founder as its first president.[48] Concerning his hopes and aspirations with regard to this college, Campbell wrote just before its establishment:

"Having now completed fifty years, and on my way to sixty, the greater part of which time I have been engaged in literary labors and pursuits, and imagining that I possess some views and attainments which I can in this way render permanently useful to this community and posterity, I feel in duty bound to offer this project to the consideration of all the friends of literature, morality and unsectarian Bible Christianity. I am willing to bestow much personal labor without any charge in getting up this institution, and also to invest a few thousand dollars in it; provided only our brethren—the rich and opulent especially—and those who have children to educate, will take a strong hold of it, and determine to build up an establishment that may be made to themselves, their children and many others a lasting and a comprehensive blessing."[49]

Many people have thought that the location of Bethany College was a mistake, but this is not evident. The school, of course, had to be west of the Alleghenies, for the people from whom it would draw its students were there. Keeping this fact in mind, it will be seen that Bethany possessed decided advantages. It was in Brooke County, Virginia,

[48] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 469.
[49] *Ibid.*, II., 469.

now West Virginia, forty miles south of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, and seven miles from Wellsburg, on the Ohio River. Since there were very few railroads then, travel was principally confined to the waterways. The college surroundings were excellent. The clear waters of the Buffalo, the rugged mountains, the picturesque valleys, and the giant forests made Bethany an ideal spot for student life. Moreover, its isolation was a safeguard against the corruptions of city life. Then,too, it was near the center of population, and in close touch with it. At the present time a trolley line connects Bethany with Wellsburg.[50]

Bethany College grew steadily. At the second meeting of the Board of Trustees, May 10, 1841, four professors were appointed—W. K. Pendleton (who had just married Campbell's daughter, Lavinia), Andrew F. Ross, Charles Stewart, and Robert Richardson.[51] Campbell gave most of his time to the new institution, and made many tours in its behalf, besides giving it money liberally. Thus, in the fall, 1842, he visited the cities of Richmond, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York in the interests of the college, and obtained important additions to its philosophical and chemical apparatus, bought a thousand volumes for its library, and received donations and subscriptions amounting to $5000.[52]

---

[50] Davis, M. M. *The Restoration Movement of the Nineteenth Century*, 199, 200.

[51] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 470.

[52] *Ibid.*, II., 497, 498.

In 1857, the building of Bethany College was destroyed by fire. Four days later, December 14, the trustees appointed a committee to obtain plans for a new building. Alexander Campbell entered heartily into these efforts, and although nearly seventy years of age, started out in January to secure money to restore the college. He went east first. At Washington, he spoke in the Baptist church building; President Buchanan, and several members of his cabinet were present. On his return from the East, Campbell and his helpers immediately set out for Kentucky, Tennessee, and other states. In 1859, he traveled through Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, and Missouri to solicit funds for Bethany College.[53] Campbell, as previously mentioned, gave liberally during his life time, and his will bequeathed $10,000 to the college, his valuable library, and $5000 for the maintenance of Gospel preaching at Bethany, where he himself had labored so long gratuitously.[54]

Besides donating the land on which the building stood, making gifts of money, acting as president and making dangerous and arduous journeys in the interest of the college, Campbell conducted several classes. He taught the Bible each morning to the entire college, and taught it in such a way that Sacred History became the favorite study. He also had classes in intellectual philosophy, evidences of Christianity, moral science, and political economy.

[53] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 414, 415.
[54] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 659.

In addition, he preached each Lord's Day, and kept up his other interests.[55] Thus, in April, 1841, he attended a union meeting at Lexington, to discuss the desirability and practicability of Christian union. The meeting was largely attended, although few representatives of other churches were present. Dr. Fishback was the only Baptist minister who took a prominent part in the discussion. The following resolution, unanimously passed, after several days of debate, was the best that could be done: "Resolved, That the Bible, and the Bible alone, is a sufficient foundation on which all Christians may unite and build together, and that we most affectionately invite all the religious parties to an investigation of this truth."[56] Again, in connection with his general educational work, Campbell gave frequent lectures. In 1845, at Cincinnati, he delivered an address on education to the College of Teachers, and four years later, in the same city, he lectured before the Young Men's Library Association on "The Anglo-Saxon Tongue." In 1852, he lectured twice at Washington and Jefferson College on "The Destiny of Our Country," and "Phrenology, Animal Magnetism, Spirit Rappings, Etc."[57]

Campbell's views on education were interesting and instructive. He would begin at the nursery, and have family, school, college, and church educa-

[55] *Richardson, R. Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 485.

[56] *Ibid.*, II., 486, 487.

[57] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 412, 413. In addition to the duties indicated above, Campbell kept up his paper, his farming, and served as postmaster at Bethany (*Millennial Harbinger*, II., 412).

tion adapted to the physical, intellectual, moral, and religious constitution of man. Thus for boys under fourteen he would have a home presided over by a patron and a matron. The boys were to be given plenty of wholesome amusement and exercise, subjected to kind parental discipline, taught in the precepts and promises of the Bible, trained in morality and religion, and as far as possible to have their studies such as the elements of natural history, agriculture, etc., connected with their amusements. Education in the school was to be conducted on the same general principles, and to include a complete course of preparation for college. Nevertheless, the supreme end was the formation of moral character, and the culture of the heart. In the college, he proposed a liberal course of studies, emphasizing rather more than usual the physical sciences. He wanted to prepare young men to take up the study of the learned professions. In this department, as in the first two, however, moral and religious training was to form one of the principal features, and the Bible was to be made a text book to be used every day. In the last place, the church with which the institution was to be connected, taking in all who were members, would offer to the world an example of conformity to the requirements of religion, and show forth the truths and excellences of the Christian Gospel.[58]

Beginning with the late forties, Bethany College commenced to send out talented and educated

[58] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell.* II., 463, 464.

ministers who gave a mighty impulse to the cause of the "Reformation." New colleges, high schools, and seminaries were springing up to aid in the spread of the new movement. The churches, knowing their debt to Campbell's energy and foresight, felt more disposed to complete the endowment of Bethany College, and to aid in the formation of new ones. But so anxious were they to secure Campbell's labor among them, that they usually made a visit the condition of a subscription. Thus, in 1852, Missouri promised to endow a chair if he would make another tour through the state. This he did.[59]

Bacon College was a forerunner of Bethany. It had been rather unexpectedly founded at Georgetown, Kentucky, in 1836. Campbell hesitated with regard to Bethany at first, for he did not wish to divert funds from Bacon College. The latter was moved to Harrodsburg under favorable circumstances, however, in 1840; hence Bethany was established, and with its foundation the real movement for education among the Disciples began.[60] Within the next twenty years several schools were founded; among the number were: The College for the Education of Orphan Girls at Midway, Kentucky, in 1849; Hiram, Hiram, Ohio, 1850; Butler, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1850; Christian College, Columbia, Missouri, 1852; Christian University, Canton, Missouri, 1853 (this is said to be the first college in

[59] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 595, 596.
[60] *Ibid.*, II., 648.

the United States to grant to women all the privileges granted to men); Eureka, Eureka, Illinois, 1855; Oskaloosa, Oskaloosa, Iowa, 1856; and Kentucky University, Lexington, Kentucky. The latter was formerly Bacon College and Transylvania University.[61] Transylvania is the oldest college west of the Alleghenies. It really began its course in 1798, with Washington, John Adams, Aaron Burr, and Lafayette as contributors to the first endowment fund. Henry Clay was at one time on its faculty and Jefferson Davis was a student within its walls for four years.[62] With the growth of schools, which was much more rapid after the Civil War, though clearly apparent before, the ministers and workers became better educated, and now Disciple clergy, with few exceptions, are on a par with any others, at least among the so called popular churches.

The last method of propagating doctrines to be considered here is the organized missionary work. Alexander Campbell, it will be remembered, was at first opposed to organized missions, but he was big enough to change his mind on this subject as he did on other things, for instance, Bible schools, a paid clergy, and the co-operation of the various local churches. In 1849, due partly to his influence, the American Christian Missionary Society was formed, and he was elected president. The

[61] Moore, W. T. *Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ*, 462.

[62] Davis, M. M. *Restoration Movement of the Nineteenth Century*, 200.

new organization was immediately attacked as a society with a "money basis," a delegated membership, and the beginning of an apostasy from New Testament Christianity. The article of the constitution which was most widely condemned, as equivalent to the establishment of a moneyed aristocracy, read: "The society shall be composed of annual delegates, life members, and life directors. Any church may appoint a delegate for an annual contribution of $10; and $20 paid at one time shall be requisite to constitute a member for life."[63]

From the organization of this society until his death in 1866, Campbell was actively interested in the missionary work, was president of the organization most of the time, and with a few exceptions, delivered the annual address. The first missionary sent out of the country was a Dr. Barclay to Jerusalem in 1850. Missions at Liberia and Jamaica were also established during Campbell's life time, but the real missionary activity of the Disciples was a later development.[64] Nevertheless, Campbell helped to stimulate missionary activity by his addresses and by his liberal contributions. Just two years before his death, he gave the copyright of his hymn book to the Missionary Society.[65]

The emphasis placed on missionary work after 1840 was an important cause of the rapid growth of

[63] *Special Reports of the Bureau of the Census, Religious Bodies*, 1906, Part II., 242.

[64] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 607.

[65] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 413-415.

the Disciples. Since the Kentucky union, they had been making tours all over the country. In 1847, Campbell advocated his views in England, Ireland, and Wales.[66] The spread of the movement, however, was not limited to the United States and England. Campbell himself visited Canada and helped organize churches there. Even earlier than this, May, 1846, he had received a letter, one year and six weeks in transit from Nelson, New Zealand, telling of the organization of a Christian Church in that place.[67]

Although foreign missions amounted to little in the early period, prior to Campbell's death in 1866, they, nevertheless, exercised a favorable influence on the church at home. The Bible School movement was pushed, and state missionary societies were formed. The Ohio Society was organized in 1852, the Illinois Society in 1856, and the New York Society in 1861.[68] New life came to the Disciples,

---

[66] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 549-572.

[67] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 412.

[68] In the years, 1868-1883 inclusive, state societies were formed in Michigan, Nebraska, Iowa, West Virginia, Virginia, California, Maryland, Georgia, Oregon, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Arkansas, North Carolina, Texas, Colorado, and Kansas (see Moore, W. T. *Comprehensive History . . .*, 451-458).

The Christian Woman's Board of Missions was founded in 1874 and the Foreign Christian Missionary Society in the following year. These helped secure co-operation, but until recent years the American Christian Missionary Society, though its action was not binding on the local churches, proved the most effective agency in securing unity of action among the Disciples of Christ. The activity of this society, however, was largely limited to the organization of churches, the support of pastors, the sending out of evangelists, the distribution of help-

for always the missionary church or organization is the growing organization. The inspired writer must have thought of this law of growth, true of individuals as well of organizations, when he wrote: "There is that scattereth and yet increaseth; and

ful tracts and the publication of the *American Home Missionary;* consequently an increasing number of Disciples began to favor a general convention, which could discuss anything relating to their work. This sentiment led to the formation of the General Convention of Churches of Christ at Atlanta, Georgia, in 1914. The preamble to the constitution read:

"Whereas, There is a widespread feeling among the Disciples of Christ that they need a closer unification of their various missionary, educational and benevolent organizations, and a more general fellowship of the Churches of Christ in all co-operative efforts for the extension of the Kingdom of God in the world, and believing that this unity and fellowship would result in their own greater efficiency:

"Therefore, We Members of Churches of Christ in convention assembled, reaffirming our steadfast adherence to the independence and autonomy of the local churches and inviting the fellowship of all our sister churches in the accomplishment of these ends, do adopt the following constitution:"

Article II. of the Constitution read:

"The object of this Convention shall be to promote unity, economy and efficiency among all the philanthropic organizations of the churches of Christ; and to secure equitable representation of the churches in an annual convention which shall receive the reports of and be advisory to such philanthropic organizations, thus securing a closer co-operation in the work of the Kingdom of God."

Each church is allowed to appoint one representative, with an additional representative for every hundred above the first hundred, provided that no church has more than five. The officers are president, three vice-presidents, recording secretary, corresponding secretary, and treasurer. These, with eight other members, form the executive committee. Any member of the church in good standing is eligible to office. The constitution can be altered or amended by a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting at any regular session of the Convention, provided notice in writing was given by the Executive Committee or any fifteen members at the previous annual convention (see the *American Home Missionary,* 1915, containing *The Year Book of Churches of Christ,* 43-45).

there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty.''[69] Truly the Disciples of Christ have found that ''bread cast upon the waters'' returns many fold.

[69] *Proverbs* 11: 24.

IX

DIFFICULTIES AND PROGRESS, 1830-1866

DURING this period, many vexing and perplexing problems came up for consideration, among them being: Mormonism, the name of the new movement, the millennium, the Lunenburg Letter, the use of the organ in the church service, communion, slavery, and war.

The Mormon question for a while appeared very threatening to the Disciples because it carried away one of the most popular preachers in the Western Reserve, Sidney Rigdon, to whom Alexander Campbell had paid high tribute, and for whom he had secured a position with the Pittsburg church.[1] Rigdon accompanied Campbell to Kentucky when the latter debated with MacCalla.[2] He was also on intimate terms with Walter Scott, and in 1824, their two churches, both in Pittsburg, were united.[3] This intimacy with Campbell and Scott appears to have continued until 1830, when the Mormons sent an embassy with the intention of winning Rigdon over to their side. This was not difficult. In fact, some

[1] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 44-47.
[2] *Ibid.*, II., 71.
[3] *Ibid.*, II., 99.

writers declare that he came into possession of the Spaulding manuscript, and deliberately altered it to suit his purposes.[4] Such a supposition, nevertheless, is not necessary in order to give a satisfactory explanation of Rigdon's apostacy. Though a fluent and captivating speaker, he was jealous of others and intensely ambitious. He knew also that he was not fully trusted by the Disciples. Again, he was extremely imaginative and possessed of a high degree of credulity, living in expectation of some great event.[5] Moreover, he was angry at Thomas Campbell's successful opposition at Austintown to his common property scheme, which he declared was part of the ancient Gospel as exhibited in the latter part of the second chapter of *Acts*.[6] Campbell, in opposition, argued as follows:

1. The "community system" in the second chapter of *Acts* was formed not to make property, but to consume it, under certain special circumstances attending that case.

2. The case of Ananias and Sapphira ended the matter.

3. Various passages in *Corinthians* and elsewhere, asking contributions for benevolent objects, show that a community system did not prevail among the primitive churches.[7]

---

[4] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 344, 345, also Moore, W. T. *Comprehensive History of Disciples*, 300, 301.

[5] Hayden, A. S. *History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve*, 209.

[6] *Ibid.*, 209.

[7] *Ibid.*, 299.

In addition to the above causes, Parley P. Pratt, an intimate friend of Rigdon's, had been converted by the Mormons.[8] For all of these reasons, then, when Pratt, Oliver Cowdery, and two others visited Rigdon, he was won over after a little opposition. On the next Sunday, Rigdon failed in his attempt to preach at Kirtland. Cowdery and Pratt did most of the talking. On the same day, Rigdon and his wife, with many of the church members, were baptized into the new faith. Rigdon then spent about two months with Smith, receiving "revelations," preaching, and urging people to accept the new religion.[9]

Aside from Rigdon, Pratt, and Orson Hyde, the last two young and little known, no Disciple preachers accepted Mormonism, and save at Kirtland, Hiram, and Mantua, few Disciples. In these places, Rigdon's popularity gave the movement quite a hold. In other regions, however, Disciple ministers succeeded in checking the new church. Thomas Campbell spent much of the winter in Mentor and vicinity in combating the movement.[10]

Occasionally, nevertheless, the admiration for Rigdon carried members into the new organization in spite of everything that could be done. Thus at Mantua, Oliver Snow and his family, Symonds Ryder, Ezra Booth, and others received the "New

[8] Hayden, A. S. *History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve*, 210.

[9] *Ibid.*, 210-214.

[10] *Ibid.*, 216-220.

Dispensation." Eliza Snow, afterwards known among the Mormons as the "Poetess," led the way for six or seven others. Two of these were later restored. Symonds Ryder soon regained his former position of influence among the Disciples. His relations with the Mormons were very interesting. Ezra Booth, of Mantua, a Methodist minister of more than ordinary culture, with his wife, a Mr. and Mrs. Johnson, and other citizens visited Smith at his home in Kirtland, in 1831. During the interview, conversation turned to the subject of supernatural gifts such as were conferred in apostolic days. Some one remarked: "Here is Mrs. Johnson with a lame arm; has God given any power to men now on earth to cure her?"[11] A few minutes later, when the conversation had changed in another direction, Smith rose, walked across the room, took Mrs. Johnson by the hand and said in the most solemn and impressive manner: "Woman, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, I command thee to be whole,"[12] and at once left the room. Hayden continued the account thus:

"The company were awestricken at the infinite presumption of the man and the calm assurance with which he spoke. The sudden mental and moral shock—I know not how better to explain the well attested fact—electrified the rheumatic arm—Mrs. Johnson at once lifted it up with ease, and on her return home the next day she was able to do her washing without difficulty or pain."[13]

---

[11] Hayden, A. S. *History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve*, 250.

[12] *Ibid.*, 250.

[13] *Ibid.*, 250.

Soon after this incident, Booth preached in Ryder's church at Hiram and made quite an impression. A little while afterwards, Ryder went to Kirtland to hear for himself, and apparently rejected the claims of Mormonism. A short time later, however, he read in a newspaper an account of the destroying of Peking,[14] and he remembered that six weeks before a young Mormon girl had predicted the destruction of that city. Soon after this, he publicly declared his adhesion to the Mormon faith. Nevertheless, he appeared to have doubts still, for he and Ezra Booth, an intimate friend, vowed that "they would faithfully aid each other in discerning the truth or the falsity of the new doctrine."[15]

In a short time, the latter was commissioned to go to Missouri to explore the promised land and lay the foundations of new Zion. Ryder was informed that, by a special revelation, he had been appointed and commissioned an elder in the Mormon Church. To his great perturbation, however, his name was misspelled in the commission. "Was the Holy Spirit so fallible as to fail in orthography?" he asked himself. Beginning with this, he re-examined the ground upon which he stood. In

[14] It seems possible that Hayden is in error on this point, and that "Peking" should read "Warsaw." The writer examined several histories of China, and not one mentioned the destruction of Peking in 1831, although a rebellion was going on then. Warsaw, however, was wrested from the Poles after desperate fighting early in 1831 (see Hazen, C. D. *Europe Since 1815*, 109).

[15] Hayden, A. S. *History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve*, 251.

the meantime, his friend Booth, on his pilgrimage to Missouri, had been passing through a similar experience of disillusionment. When the two met, about September 1, 1831, the first question from each was, "How is your faith?", and the first look showed that the spell was broken. Many citizens of Hiram had accepted the doctrines of Smith and Rigdon, but the work of Ryder and Booth went far to turn the tide and lead back many who were drifting on its current.[16] When A. S. Hayden was preparing the history often referred to in this book, he wrote to Ryder for information concerning the advent of Mormonism. Since the man addressed was in intimate touch with the movement, it seems advisable to give a rather full quotation from his reply:

"Dear Brother Hayden:

". . . . To give particulars of the Mormon excitement of 1831 would require a volume—a few words must suffice. It has been stated that from the year 1815 to 1835, a period of twenty years, 'all sorts of doctrine by all sorts of preachers had been pled;' and most of the people of Hiram had been disposed to turn out and hear. This went by the specious name of 'Liberal.' The Mormons in Kirtland, being informed of this peculiar state of things, were soon prepared for the onset.

"In the winter of 1831 Joseph Smith, with others, had an appointment in the south school-house, in Hiram. Such was the apparent piety, sincerity and humility of the speakers, that many of the hearers were greatly affected, and thought it impossible that such preachers should lie in wait to deceive.

---

[16] Hayden, A. S. *History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve*, 250.

"During the next spring and summer several converts were made, and their success seemed to indicate an immediate triumph in Hiram. But when they went to Missouri to lay the foundation of the splendid city of Zion, and also of the temple, they left their papers behind. This gave their new converts an opportunity to become acquainted with the internal arrangement of their church, which revealed to them the horrid fact that a plot was laid to take their property from them and place it under the control of Joseph Smith the prophet. This was too much for the Hiramites, and they left the Mormonites faster than they had ever joined them, and by fall the Mormon church in Hiram was a very lean concern.

"But some who had been the dupes of this deception, determined not to let it pass with impunity; and, accordingly, a company was formed of citizens from Shalersville, Garrettsville, and Hiram, in March, 1832, and proceeded to headquarters in the darkness of night, and took Smith and Rigdon from their beds, and tarred and feathered them both, and let them go. This had the desired effect, which was to get rid of them. They soon left for Kirtland.

"All who continued with the Mormons, and had any property, lost all; among whom was John Johnson, one of our most worthy men; also, Esq. Snow, of Mantua, who lost two or three thousand dollars. Symonds Ryder."[17]

In concluding this topic, a word may be in place with regard to the fortunes of Mormonism. Immediately after the publication of the *Book of Mormon,* Smith organized the "Church of Latter Day Saints" at Palmyra, and sent forth his "apostles" to convert the world. The effect on the Disciples of Christ has already been indicated. Other

[17] Hayden, A. S. *History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve,* 221.

churches suffered also, for many proselytes were won to the new religion in northern Ohio. Most of these were ignorant and superstitious, but some, it must be admitted, were persons of intelligence. A temple was erected at Kirtland, and a bank was established there. Soon, however, the Mormons found it necessary to emigrate to Independence, Missouri. From there, largely increased in numbers, they were driven to Illinois, where they erected another temple and built the city of Nauvoo. Trouble with the citizens of Illinois resulted in the murder of Smith, and the journey to Utah, where the Mormons created a magnificent city and erected a wonderful temple. After the death of Smith, Rigdon and Brigham Young disputed the leadership; Young, the more competent man, won. Rigdon was expelled from the community and retired to the interior of New York, in which state he lived in comparative obscurity.[18]

A second question was that of the name for the movement. Most of the people in it recognized any New Testament term as valid,—thus "Church of God," "Churches of Christ," "Christian" and "Disciples" were admitted; but the emphasis was placed on the last two. The people in the West generally favored the term "Christian," whereas those in the older districts of the East usually favored, "Disciples of Christ." The same preference still holds in these sections, but the terms are

[18] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 346-348.

often used interchangeably. Most Disciples will recognize the name "Christian;" in fact, many of them prefer it. Writers of the Christian Connection, however, as M. T. Morrill, J. J. Summerbell, O. B. Whitaker, and J. F. Burnett, deny the right of the Disciples to that name, and quote extensively from Alexander Campbell in proof of their assertions. They forget, apparently, that, while Campbell is considered the greatest leader of the Disciples, he is not regarded as their founder or as the maker of their theology. Morrill wrote:

". . . . Thousands of people in our land never heard of the Christians, and hundreds are confusing the Christians with the Disciples of Christ; indeed, in some parts of the country the Disciples themselves can hardly make the distinction, and do not know exactly why they are calling themselves the 'Christian Church.' Their writers are claiming Stone and Purviance and O'Kelly and Haggard as founders of their sect. . . . This volume should aid in dispelling all confusion, informing the Christians about themselves, informing the Disciples that the Christian denomination was organized a quarter of a century before the Disciples were, and, finally, giving the public knowledge of a denomination that early played a remarkable part in the religious history of America."[19]

On this point, Summerbell said: "In some places the Disciples take the same name Christian, and since members of the Christians join them under the influence of that name, they cling to it afterwards,"[20] and again: "The Disciples answer to the

[19] *History of the Christian Denomination in America*, Foreword.
[20] *The Christians and Disciples*, 2.

name 'Church of Christ,' or 'Churches of Christ,' to the name 'Christian,' to the name 'Disciple,' to the name 'Reformers,' etc., all good names; but they were definitely named by their founder 'Disciples of Christ.' ''[21] Whitaker wrote: ''Their movement began in a spirit of proselyting, which spirit has largely characterized their subsequent history—probably no one thing has so well served them in this purpose as has their unjustifiable use of the name 'Christian Church.' ''[22] Burnett made similar statements and quoted extensively from Alexander Campbell's writings to show that he favored the term ''Disciples of Christ,'' but he also quoted from Stone to show that the latter favored the term ''Christian.''[23]

This disagreement between the greatest leaders of the ''Reformation'' accounts for the prevalence of the two names. O'Kelly, Jones, and Stone, as previously mentioned, used the term ''Christian.'' Because of this, Campbell and many of his immediate followers opposed the use of that designation. Stone, although the most liberal of the great leaders, considered Campbell and others worthy of blame for ''rejecting the name Christian, as a family name, because the old Christians had taken it before them.''[24] He thought that the name ''Christian'' was given by divine authority and ought to

---

[21] *The Christians and Disciples*, 3.

[22] *Vital Distinctions between Christians and Campbellites*, 14, 15.

[23] *Origin and Principles of Christians*, 22-32.

[24] Rogers, J. R. *Cane Ridge Meeting House, Autobiography*, 203.

be considered the distinguishing title of every follower of Christ; in this view, Thomas Campbell agreed.[35] Advocates of the term "Christian" made a very extensive use of *Acts* 11:26. A writer in the *Christian Baptist*, apparently Thomas Campbell under the pen name of Theophilus, referred to this passage in claiming a divine origin for the name. He said:

"It was to be the name, the only distinguishing name of the Messiah's people; therefore, it was meet that it should be imposed by himself—that 'the mouth of the Lord' should name it. Again, its perpetuity was to be equal to its extent; for as this important name was to cover or include the whole of Christ's people co-existing upon earth at any one time, so it was to continue to the end of time—'so shall your seed and your name remain.' Again, it was to answer the most important ends to the subjects; it was to absorb and obliterate for ever all names of partial distinction in the grand republic of religion and morals; and thus to unite in one grand religious community, without distinction, the whole human family under Christ—we mean as many of all nations as should believe in his name. Accordingly we find this name first given to the disciples at Antioch, in Syria, shortly after the gospel had been first preached to mere Gentiles, in Cesaria, in the house of Cornelius; the immediate consequence of which, as appears, was the exhibition of the gospel to the citizens of Antioch, without distinction of Jew or Gentile; and that with great success among the latter. See Acts XI, 19-24. Now for the first time, a great and mixed multitude, but chiefly Gentiles, were converted in the same city, and became to-gether disciples of the same Lord. Now was the time, the precise time, when a new and appropriate name became necessary in order to unite these hitherto

[35] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 371.

dissociated and jarring characters into one associate body: a name, too, of such powerful import, as might supersede and bury forever all offensive recollection of former hateful distinctions. Now we see that it was at this critical juncture, this precise point of time, and not before, while discipleship was confined to the Jews, and their religious proselytes only; for these were already united in the religion of Moses. See, reader, the wise and gracious management of the divine economy, and that the Lord does nothing in vain! Well might the apostle say, that, 'in the exceeding riches of his grace, he has abounded towards us in all wisdom and prudence.' ''[26]

Alexander Campbell stood on the opposite side of the question. He favored the term ''Disciples of Christ'' for the following reasons:

1. It was more ancient.
2. It was more descriptive.
3. It was more Scriptural.
4. It was more unappropriated.

With regard to the first point, he declared that the term ''Christian'' was used for the first time at Antioch. He said that those who from the day of Pentecost had been known throughout Judea, Galilee, and Samaria as Disciples of Christ, were several years later at Antioch first called Christians. In the second place, he argued:

''Germans, Franks, Greeks, Romans, Americans, Columbians, Jeffersonians, etc., do not describe the persons who bear their names; for they are not supposed to be the pupils of such men. Might not a stranger, an alien, imagine that *Christian* like *American* or *Roman*, had some reference

[26] The *Christian Baptist*, December 6, 1824.

to country or some benefactor, or some particular circumstance, rather than scholarship? Disciples of Christ is, then, a more descriptive and definite designation than Christian.''[m]

In the third place, Campbell declared that the word ''Christian'' occurred only twice in the Book of *Acts*—used by the Antiochians and by King Agrippa, whereas the word ''Disciples'' was used over thirty times. Again, he pointed out that Luke often used the terms ''brethren'' and ''Disciples,'' but never ''Christians,'' and that in all the epistles the word was used only once, and then under circumstances which made it evident that the term was used by enemies rather than by friends. For these reasons, Campbell believed the name ''Disciples'' much more Scriptural. Lastly, he considered the term much more unappropriated. Unitarians, Arians, and other sects, he declared, were zealous for the name ''Christian,'' while the Reformers were the only people fairly and indisputably using the title ''Disciples of Christ.'' Said he:

''Were I, or any brother, to traverse much of New York, New England, and some other sections, and call ourselves *Christians,* as a party name, we should be admitted by all Unitarians and rejected by all of a different belief. One party would fraternize with us, while the others would repudiate us and unchurch us, because of our supposed Unitarianism, Arianism, etc. For this reason we prefer an unappropriated name, which is indeed neither more nor less than the Scriptural equivalent of *Christian;* for who were called Christians first at Antioch? They had a prior—a

[m] *Millennial Harbinger,* II., 371, 372.

more ancient name. They were called *Disciples.* Disciples of Whom? Of Christ. *Disciples of Christ* is, then, a more ancient title than *Christian,* while it fully includes the whole idea. It is, then, as divine, as authoritative as the name *Christian,* and more ancient.''[28]

Another question of intense interest to some people, especially to Walter Scott, whom Campbell regarded as next to his father his ''most cordial and indefatigable fellow laborer in the origin and progress of the present reformation''[29] was the millennium. Hopes for the coming of the millennium were largely based on the wonderful success which had been attending the Gospel plea. People of all religious beliefs were flocking to the flag unfurled by Scott and others. The evangelist of the Mahoning Association, in common with a few ministers of a like ardent temperament, cherished the hope that the erroneous religious systems would be quickly overthrown, that the happy millennial period would be speedily ushered in, that the Gospel would triumph, and Christ's prayer for unity would be realized. Campbell shared to some extent in these hopes, but he anticipated the difficulties more than Scott did.[30] Moreover, he did not want any fond anticipations to interfere with the actual work of spreading the Gospel; hence he threw a restraining influence over his impetuous colleague, who had written two articles on the subject for the

[28] *Millennial Harbinger,* II., 371.
[29] *Ibid.,* II., 548.
[30] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 225.

Christian Baptist under the pen name of Philip.[31] Campbell did not presume to fix any very definite period for the coming of Christ, because he did not consider it consistent with "Reformation" principles to assert dogmatically any position on a disputed point. Since the subject was of great interest to many, however, particularly to Walter Scott, and since, moreover, he intended to take up the Scriptures relating to the matter, he determined to call the successor to the *Christian Baptist* the *Millennial Harbinger*.[32]

In every organization, apparently, Liberals and Conservatives are found. Churches do not form exceptions. The division among the Disciples of Christ was precipitated by the so-called "Lunenburg Letter," which read in part:

Lunenburg, July 8th, 1837.

"Dear Brother Campbell:—I was much surprised to-day, while reading the *Harbinger*, to see, that you recognize the Protestant parties as Christians. You say, you 'find in all Protestant parties Christians.'

"Dear brother, my surprise, and ardent desire to do what is right, prompt me to write to you at this time. I feel well assured, from the estimate you place on the female character, that you will attend to my feeble questions in search of knowledge.

"Will you be so good as to let me know how any one becomes a Christian? What act of yours gave you the name of Christian? At what time had Paul the name of Christ called on him? At what time did Cornelius have Christ

---

[31] July 6, 1826, and September 7, 1826.

[32] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 302, 303.

named on him? Is it not through this name we obtain eternal life? Does the name of Christ, or Christian, belong to any but those who believe the *gospel*, repent, and are buried by baptism into the death of Christ?''[33]

Campbell did not answer these questions one by one, but he did go to the main point. He said:

''In reply to this conscientious sister, I observe that if there be no Christians in the Protestant sects, there are certainly none among the Romanists, none among the Jews, Turks, Pagans; and therefore no Christians in the world except ourselves, or such of us as keep, or strive to keep, all of the commandments of Jesus. Therefore, for many centuries there has been no church of Christ, no Christians in the world; and the promises concerning the *everlasting kingdom of Messiah have failed, and the gates of hell have prevailed against his church!* This cannot be; and therefore there are Christians among the sects.''[34]

Continuing, he defined a Christian as any one ''that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; repents of his sins, and obeys him in all things according to his measure of knowledge of his will.''[35] Again, he wrote:

''Should I find a Pedobaptist more intelligent in the Christian Scriptures, more spiritually minded and devoted to the Lord than a Baptist, or one immersed on a profession of the ancient faith, I could not hesitate a moment in giving the preference of my heart to him that loveth most. Did I act otherwise I would be a pure sectarian, a Pharisee among Christians. Still I will be asked, How do I know

[33] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 379.
[34] *Ibid.*, II., 379.
[35] *Ibid.*, II., 380.

that any one loves my Master but by his obedience to his commandments? I answer, *in no other way*. But mark, I do not substitute obedience to one commandment, for universal or even for general obedience. And should I see a sectarian Baptist or a Pedobaptist more spiritually minded, more generally conformed to the requisitions of the Messiah, than one who precisely acquiesces with me in the theory or practice of immersion as I teach, doubtless the former, rather than the latter, would have my cordial approbation and love as a Christian. So I judge, and so I feel. It is the image of Christ the Christian looks for and loves; and this does not consist in being exact in a few items, but in general devotion to the whole truth as far as known."[36]

Campbell considered it possible for a person to have the inward baptism without the outward. A person then who misapprehended the outward form of baptism, but submitted according to his view of it might have the inward baptism. In spite of certain iconoclastic views, he was liberal. Thus, in the debate with Bishop Purcell, 1837, he had said:

"No good, no religious, moral or virtuous man, can perish through our views or principles. Our theory thunders terror to none but the self-condemned. Human responsibility, in my views and doctrines, always depends upon, and is measured by, human ability. It is so, certainly, under the gospel. The man born blind will not be condemned for not seeing, nor the deaf for not hearing. The man who never heard the gospel, cannot disobey it; and he who, through any physical impossibility, is prevented from any ordinance, is no transgressor. It is only he who knows, and has power to do, his Master's will, that shall be punished for disobedience. None suffer, in our views, but those who are wilfully ignorant, or negligent of their duty. Natural

[36] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 380.

ability, time, place, and circumstances are all to be taken into account; and none but those who sin against these, are, on our theory, to perish with an everlasting destruction, 'from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.'"[37]

This opinion, that there were Christians among the sects, led to much criticism of Campbell by those who were narrow and exclusive. The narrow or strict party held that since baptism was for the remission of sins and only immersion was baptism, those who had not been immersed were still in their sins and unsaved. The discussion developed among the Disciples two different parties; a narrow literal party and a liberal spiritual one. The first identified the true Christian Church by such external marks as creed, worship, organization, and discipline. To this party the true Christian was the one in fellowship with the order of things. The strict party almost went so far as to declare that no one could be saved outside of a church organized according to the primitive model in external features. Campbell and other leaders, however, arrayed themselves on the side of a broader, and more spiritual conception.[38] Campbell wrote:

"I circumscribe not the Divine philanthropy—the Divine grace. I dare not say there is no salvation in the church of Rome, or that of Constantinople; though, certainly, Protestants do not regard them as churches builded upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the

[37] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 383.
[38] Gates, E. *Disciples of Christ*, 232-234.

chief corner-stone. In all the Protestant parties there are many excellent spirits, that mourn over the desolations of Zion—that love the gospel and its Author most sincerely.''[39]

Campbell was not alone in his liberality, one of the phases of which was the right of the unimmersed to partake the Lord's Supper. Isaac Errett, Robert Richardson, W. K. Pendleton, and others took the same view.[40] The general position among the members of this group then, as it is with most now, was to leave the matter to each individual, expressed as follows by Errett:

''*Neither to invite nor reject* particular classes of persons, but to spread the table in the name of the Lord, for the Lord's people, and allow all to come who will, each on his own responsibility. It is very common for Methodists, Presbyterians, etc., to sit down with us. We do not fail to teach them on all these questions, and very often we immerse them.

''As to our practice generally, my impression is, that fully *two-thirds* of our churches in the United States occupy this position; those churches which originally were Baptist, are rather more unyielding.''[41]

The churches which were narrow with regard to communion were generally narrow with regard to Bible School, missions, and church music. The question of the organ, in fact, was more important in its practical consequences than that of the com-

[39] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 383.

[40] *Ibid.*, 239-242.

[41] *Ibid.*, II., 240. This practice is in rather striking contrast to the custom in England, where, according to W. T. Moore, a sort of police arrangement prevents all unimmersed persons from participating (see his *Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ*, 435).

munion. Some preachers were so radical that they refused to preach in a church where an organ was played. As early as 1859, a melodeon had been placed in the church at Midway, Kentucky. Much opposition was at once aroused and the claim was made that instrumental music in the churches "ministered to pride and worldliness, was without the sanction of New Testament precept and example and was consequently unscriptural and sinful."[42] The opposition further contended that since those who favored the organ could have no conscience in the matter, they should according to the law of love, yield their preference and thus avoid wounding their brethren. Those in favor of the organ replied that its use was not contrary to the spirit of the Scriptures, even though there was no specific precept favoring the instrument. Many believed, moreover, that the Bible fairly interpreted sanctioned it. They contended also that they had a conscience involved which ought to be respected. Again, they declared that the use of the organ was not only expedient, but absolutely essential to the largest usefulness of the church. They denied, in the last place, the charge of corrupting the worship by insisting that the organ was no more a part of the worship than a hymn book or a tuning fork.[43] Isaac Errett took the right attitude when he said:

---

[42] *Special Reports of the Bureau of the Census, Religious Bodies,* 1906, Part II., 242.

[43] Davis, M. M. *The Restoration Movement of the Nineteenth Century,* 220.

"The New Testament furnishes no standard of music, the melody of the heart being made emphatic. But the requirement to *sing* implies whatever is necessary to the performance of it. Hence we have hymn-books, tune-books, tuning-forks, choirs, etc., *not because they are commanded,* but because we are commanded to sing, and these are necessary to enable us to sing to edification. . . . *It is a difference of opinion as to the means necessary to obey the precept to sing, . . and no man has a right to make it, on either side, a test of fellowship, or an occasion of stumbling.*" [44]

Benjamin Franklin, secretary of the Missionary Society in 1857, led the literalist party. He was opposed to all church music, and in spite of the efforts of Errett and others won a rather strong following. Divisions, nevertheless, came rather slowly. Many who sympathized with the Progressives continued to worship and work with the Conservatives, for they had no other church facilities. Many Conservatives, on the other hand, associated with Progressives for a similar reason.[45]

[44] Davis, M. M. *The Restoration Movement of the Nineteenth Century,* 220, 221.

[45] *Special Reports of the Bureau of the Census, Religious Bodies,* 1906, Part II., 242.

This question did not reach its height until 1870, although it started in the period under discussion in this book. Other complications came in. The party opposed to Bible Schools, organized missions, and church music also showed opposition to the introduction of a "modern pastor" and the adoption of "unscriptural means of raising money." These Conservatives were counted in the Disciple returns up to and including the Census of 1890. Since that time, however, many of them have sent in separate returns and are listed as "Churches of Christ." The latest available figures, 1906, showed a membership of 159,658 distributed among a total of 2,642 churches—631 of which were in Tennessee and 627 in Texas. They are strong also in Indiana, Kentucky and Arkansas (*Special Reports of the Bureau of the Census, Religious Bodies,* 1906, Part II., 242, 243).

One of the most important social, economic, and political problems of this early period was the question of slavery. Naturally the Disciples were divided on this matter, according to their location. Since, however, no binding rules could be passed for the whole, no general separation took place. Local divisions, nevertheless, were not unknown. On the whole, most of the leaders of the movement were strongly opposed to slavery. Thomas Campbell had established a school in Burlington, Kentucky. This institution soon became very popular. One Lord's Day, in the summer of 1819, he noticed a large number of negroes amusing themselves in a nearby grove. He immediately asked them to come into the school room to hear the reading of the Bible. They came gladly, and he read and talked to them. The next day one of his friends came to him, and told him that he had violated the state law which forbade any address to negroes except in the presence of one or more white witnesses. The friend informed him that because of his ignorance of the law nothing would be done about the matter, but he advised him not to repeat the offence. Campbell was thunderstruck at this news, and immediately determined to leave Kentucky where such a law was possible. He persisted in this resolution in spite of the remonstrances of his family and the entreaties of his friends, for he feared that his family might form marriage alliances with the slaveholders. Accordingly, he accepted his son's offer to assist him in Buffalo Seminary.

This school was in Virginia, a slave state, but it was in the northern part, bordering upon the free states of Pennsylvania and Ohio, and in a region where slavery had only a nominal existence. The negroes who remained with their masters did so because they wanted to, for escape was easy. The people themselves took little interest in slavery as an institution. Even though willing to uphold the laws on the subject, they tacitly allowed many violations. Thus, no one was molested for teaching slaves to read, and freedom of speech was granted in large degree.[46] Joseph Doddridge, an Episcopal minister in Wellsburg, Brooke County, and a warm personal friend of the Campbells, published in 1824 a book which would have caused him much trouble further south. Among other things, Doddridge wrote:

"It is a curious circumstance that while our missionaries are generously traversing the most inhospitable regions, and endeavoring with incessant toil to give the science of Europe and America, together with the Christian revelation, to the benighted pagans, most of the legislatures of our slave holding States have made it a highly penal offence to teach a slave a single letter. While, at great expense and waste of valuable lives, we are endeavoring to teach the natives of Africa the use of letters, no one durst attempt to do the same thing for the wretched descendants of that ill-fated people, bound in the fetters of slavery in America. Thus our slavery chains the soul as the body. Would a Mussulman hinder his slave from learning to read the Alcoran? Surely he would not.

[46] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 494-498.

"We are often told by slave holders that they would willingly give freedom to their slaves if they could do it with safety:—if they could get rid of them when free; but are they more dangerous when free than when in slavery! But admitting the fact that, owing to their ignorance, stupidity, and bad habits, they are unfit for freedom, we ourselves have made them so. We debase them to the condition of brutes, and then use that debasement as an argument for perpetuating their slavery."[47]

In referring to the cruel scourging of negroes, a brutality which he had witnessed while at school in Maryland, the author said:

"The recollections of the tortures which I witnessed so early in life, is still a source of affliction to my mind. Twenty-four hours never pass during which my imagination does not present me with the afflicting view of the slave or servant writhing beneath the lashes of his master, and cringing from the brine with which he salted his stripes."[48]

Such views were fearlessly expressed in northern Virginia. Thomas Campbell, nevertheless, was careful to place his family just across the border in the free state of Pennsylvania.

Since Alexander Campbell knew that the relation of master and servant was recognized in the New Testament and the duties of the parties described, he deemed it not inconsistent to assume the legal rights of a master or to sell those rights as he did in one or two cases. Slaves under his care, nevertheless, received religious instruction and en-

[47] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 499, 500. See also I., 531-534.

[48] *Ibid.*, I., 500.

joyed the opportunity of learning to read. Moreover, because he realized the danger of abuse, he was always in favor of emancipation, and he set free the two or three slaves under his control as soon as they were able to take care of themselves.[49] On certain occasions, also, he denounced slavery in no uncertain terms. Thus, after the Southampton Slave Insurrection, he wrote:

"*Slavery*, that largest and blackest blot upon our national escutcheon, that many-headed monster, that Pandora's box, that bitter root, that blighting and blasting curse under which so fair and so large a portion of our beloved country groans—that deadly Upas, whose breath pollutes and poisons everything within its influence—is now evoking the attention of this ancient and venerable commonwealth in a manner as unexpected as it is irresistible and cheering to every philanthropist—to every one who has a heart to feel, a tear to shed over human wretchedness, or a tongue to speak for degraded humanity. . . . We have always thought, and frequently said, since we became acquainted with the general views and character of the people of Virginia, that there was as much republicanism in Virginia, even in the slave holding districts, as could be found among the same number of inhabitants in any State in the Union. And, moreover, we have thought that if the abolition of slavery was *legitimately* to be laid before the people of this commonwealth, as it now is, there would be found even among slave-holders a majority to concur in a national system of emancipation."[50]

With regard to the actual project for getting rid of slavery, Campbell proposed that the ten

[49] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, I., 501, 502.
[50] *Ibid.*, II., 367.

million dollars previously used yearly for the national debt just wiped out, should go to the colonization of the colored race as stated in the following terms:

"*Be it enacted,* That from and after the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-four, the sum of ten millions of dollars shall be annually appropriated to the organization of all people of color, either slaves or free persons, in , until the soil of our free and happy country shall not be trod by the foot of a slave, nor enriched by a drop of his sweat or blood; that all the world may not believe that we are a nation of *hypocrites,* asserting all men to have certain natural and inherent rights, which in our practice we deny; and shedding crocodile tears over the fall of Warsaw, and illuminating for the revolution of the Parisians, while we have millions of miserable human beings at home held in involuntary bondage, in ignorance, degradation and vice by a *republican system of free slave holding.*"[51]

Campbell visited extensively in the South. After such a trip to South Carolina, he wrote:

"We conclude that slavery has proved no greater blessing to the far South that it has done to Virginia. It has exhausted whatever of natural fertility had been orginally in the soil; and South Carolina seems to have once had a reasonable proportion of fruitful territory. It has superinduced the worst system of agriculture which one could easily imagine; and it has imposed on the whole community views, feelings and habits exceedingly inimical to the resuscitation of the soil and the agricultural improvement and advancement of the State. Tobacco, rice and cotton are profitable crops for slave labor, but exceedingly unprofitable

[51] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,* II., 368.

for other labor; and it seems they are predestined to live to-gether; they are legally married in the South, and South Carolina favors no sort of divorces, literal or figurative, except in the conjugal affinities of States.''[52]

In spite of these views, however, Campbell was attacked as a slave holder. Thus, on his European tour, while at Edinburgh, placards were posted, reading: ''Citizens of Edinburgh—Beware! beware! The Rev. Alexander Campbell of Virginia, United States of America, has been a slave holder himself and is still a defender of manstealers.''[53] The accused man explained and defended his position on the slavery question, but enemies made misrepresentations which finally resulted in his going to jail. This was not necessary, but Campbell, believing that he was persecuted, refused to let his Glasgow friends give bail for him. He was in jail about ten days before the warrant was declared illegal.[54]

Various extracts from the *Christian Messenger* show Stone's attitude on slavery. This publication, Volume III., 1828, contained ''An Humble Address to Christians on the Colonization of Free People of Color.'' Some of the extracts typical of his attitude follow:

''All who know me, well know that for more than thirty years, I have advocated the cause of liberty, and opposed unmerited hereditary slavery. My honesty has been tested.

[52] Richardson, R. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, II., 450.
[53] *Ibid.*, II., 553.
[54] *Ibid.*, II., 554-563.

For all in my possession, I emancipated; nor did I send them out empty. A few are yet with me, not under my control, but entailed a curse upon my children by a deceased relative. They who are unapprised of this circumstance, have branded me as a slave holder. I have named this circumstance to remove any impression which might prevent the good effect designed by this address. . . .

"But every plan has been found defective but that which we now advocate, the plan of settling the free people of color in Africa. To free them and let them live among us is impolitic, as stubborn facts have proved. Were those now in slavery among us to be thus emancipated, I would instantly remove to a distant land beyond their reach. Yet had I a thousand slaves, I would gladly give them up to the Colonization Society to transport them to Liberia. . . .

"The time has been when professed Christians were blind to the evils of slavery. I have known some who have professed to be humble disciples of Christ, buy and sell their fellow creatures for gain, as they would a herd of cattle! But the era of darkness is past; no man now bearing the sacred name of religion, is engaged in such a traffic. Am I correct in this statement? Or is there yet one, a professed Christian, so blinded by the god of this world, and so lost to the truth of heaven, and so destitute of human and divine feeling, and so regardless of Christian character, and so callous to the sufferings of humanity, and so careless about his eternal destiny? Can a professed Christian yet be engaged in such a horrid traffic? If one, tell it not in Gath,—publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the wicked, scoffing world rejoice, and reproach the name of Christ: that one bearing his name and professing his religion, has done what their infidelity would blush to do. Let every Christian frown indignantly on such a practice. Let them show the world of their abhorrence of it by banishing it from among them. Let the practice be confined to those who fear not God, nor regard man. Once more I entreat all Christians—all the benevolent—all to aid the Colonization Society.

Let us associate in every church, in every town, and in every neighborhood, as auxiliaries to the mother Society in Washington. Your reward will be certain.'' [55]

John Rogers declared that Stone, although a Marylander by birth, educated in Virginia and North Carolina, and an inhabitant of Virginia for nearly fifty years, was opposed to slavery, but that he was not an abolitionist. He wrote:

''He did not indiscriminately condemn slave holders, for he lived some forty years in churches in which slave holders were members. He did not therefore make it a test of Christian fellowship. Would to God that our brethren of the North, whom we want to love and fellowship, would imitate the example of the pious Stone in this particular. . . .'' [56]

The next question, war, brought a severe testing time for the Disciples of Christ. When the Civil War broke out, they were almost equally divided in their membership between the two sections involved. From the beginning of their movement, they had objected strenuously to fighting.[57] In an address on this subject, delivered at Wheeling, Vir-

[55] Reprinted in *The Biography of Elder Barton Warren Stone, Written by Himself: with Additions and Reflections.* By Elder John Rogers, 288-291.

[56] *Ibid.*, 287.

[57] Since the Disciples recognize no creed but the Bible, or more specifically *Matthew* 16: 16, or according to their best writers, Christ himself, a person in preference to a set of beliefs, entire liberty of opinion is allowed on the war question. Other bodies, however, do not recognize this attitude. Thus, with regard to the questionaires now being filled out, no provision is made for individual opinion. According to the view of the writer and with equal right, one member of the church might claim that his creed forbade him to take part in the war, whereas another member of the same church might claim that it did not.

ginia, in 1848, Alexander Campbell had protested strongly against war.[58] In these views he was very generally followed by the Disciples. In October, 1861, the following resolution was rejected by the General Missionary Society: "Resolved, That we deeply sympathize with the loyal and patriotic of our country in their present efforts to sustain the government of the United States, and we feel it our duty as Christians to ask our brethren everywhere to do all in their power to sustain the proper and constitutional authorities of the Union."[59] As the war progressed, however, sentiment began to change, and two years later, with few dissenting votes, this resolution was passed: "Resolved, That we unqualifiedly declare our allegiance to said Government, and repudiate as false and slanderous any statements to the contrary."[60]

In spite of dissensions, the numerical increase of the Disciples has been rapid. Brush Run, the first church in the movement, was organized in 1811, with thirty members. Alexander Campbell was ordained January 1, 1812; his aims then were very limited. Both father and son were opposed to founding a new church. They simply wanted to worship as they pleased. In 1820, there were only three preachers and six churches, with an aggregate membership of less than two hundred.[61] Soon,

[58] Campbell, A. *Popular Lectures and Addresses*, 342-366.
[59] Moore, W. T. *Comprehensive History of Disciples*, 492.
[60] *Ibid.*, 493.
[61] McLean, A. *Thomas and Alexander Campbell*, 29.

nevertheless, the number of Reformers began to increase with marked rapidity, largely due to Campbell's ability as a debater and his editorship of the *Christian Baptist*. Many of the early additions came during the relation with the Baptists, but as previously pointed out, most of these took the side of the Reformers when the division came. Often, too, ministers from other churches joined the new organization. Thus, the *Christian Baptist*, July 7, 1828, told of one Methodist and two Universalist preachers of Ohio, who had renounced their favorite "isms" and had been immersed into the belief of the ancient Gospel. A. S. Hayden gave the story of John Schaeffer, a young Lutheran minister who was thrust out of his church in 1834, because he had repudiated infant baptism. He came to the Disciples.[62] Reforming Baptist ministers obtained remarkable results in 1828. Jeremiah Vardeman of Kentucky baptized 550 persons in six months. John Smith of Montgomery County, Kentucky, baptized 339 persons from the first Lord's Day in February to April 20. Scott, Rigdon, and Bentley baptized about eight hundred people in Ohio during a period of six months. Lane of Washington County, Virginia, and Warder of Mayslick, Kentucky, also baptized numerous converts.[63]

After the separation from the Baptists, the Disciples continued to increase rapidly. Their strength

[62] *History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve*, 324-331.
[63] The *Christian Baptist*, June 2, 1828.

early developed in the agricultural states as Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Virginia, for their message appealed to the farmers more than to the city people. Even to-day, the principal strength of the Disciples is in the country districts rather than in the cities. In Kentucky, after the union of the Disciples with the "Christians" under the leadership of Barton W. Stone, the united body numbered ten thousand.[64] The increase after 1830 was not so much by accessions from the Baptists as by a general diffusion of principles among all parties, and by a wonderful success in converting those who had not yet taken up any religious system of the day. Many came over from the Presbyterians, some from the Episcopalians and Lutherans, but more, both of preachers and people, from the Methodists. Some Universalists after giving up their own distinctive beliefs, united with the Disciples. Roman Catholics, Tunkers, English and Scotch Baptists, and Independents did likewise. In fact, almost every religious party contributed to the new movement, and not a few skeptics and infidels were converted after Campbell's able defence of Christianity against Robert Owen. With the evangelistic zeal of Stone's followers added, and with the impetus given by education and missionary organizations, converts increased with unparalleled rapidity. One of the leading historians of the Disciples estimated that beginning with 1840, about twenty thousand additions were made yearly for

[64] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 409.

the decade. This represented a clear gain of some fifteen thousand yearly, and gave the Disciples a total numerical strength of about two hundred thousand in 1850.[65] During the next ten years, while the population of the country increased about thirty-five per cent, the number of Disciples doubled. By the time of Alexander Campbell's death in 1866, their number was approximately half a million. Joseph King, pastor of the Christian Church in Allegheny City, Pennsylvania, on March 18, 1866, delivered a memorial sermon on Alexander Campbell, in which he said:

"And has not God blessed his labors? Has not heaven smiled upon him? Have not his efforts been crowned with success? For, while in 1820 his adherents were scarcely more than two hundred, now, in 1866, those who accept, substantially, the views taught by him, as most in harmony with the word of God, number not less than half a million, and to-day, in proportion to their numbers, they are increasing more rapidly than any other Protestant community in our country."[66]

A very brief recapitulation may be made by way of summary, in conclusion:

---

[65] Moore, W. T. *Comprehensive History of the Disciples*, 377.

[66] *Millennial Harbinger*, II., 588, 589. See also Moore, W. T. *Comprehensive History of the Disciples*, 522, and McLean, A. *Thomas and Alexander Campbell*, 29.

The present membership of the Disciples of Christ is nearly a million and a half. At the Pittsburg Centennial, in 1909, the following figures were given: Churches, 11,714; Bible Schools, 8,752; ministers, 6,861; communicants, 1,327,559; Bible School Students, 984,883; total church valuation, $29,742,244. These figures did not include the "Churches of Christ" which were opposed to organized effort (Moore, W. T. *Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ*, 810-822).

I. The period 1790-1860 witnessed a rapid and much needed improvement in social, industrial, and religious conditions.

II. The "Reformation" movement was an outgrowth of general social, political and religious conditions, principally the latter, and its ground work had been prepared by the labors of James O'Kelly, who led a revolt from the Methodists in Virginia and the Carolinas; by Abner Jones, who led a similar schism from the Baptists in Vermont; and by Barton W. Stone, who led the movement from the Presbyterians in Kentucky. These three widely separated movements coalesced, with Stone as leader, and were partially absorbed by the "Reformation" proper, which was led by Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, and Walter Scott.

III. Although this church was essentially a product of the American frontier, two of its great leaders—the Campbells—were decidedly influenced by religious conditions in Scotland and Ireland, and the third, Walter Scott, was born in Scotland, though less influenced by conditions there than either of the others.

IV. The liberal ideas of the Campbells with regard to communion led to their forced and unwilling retirement from the Presbyterian Church, and the formation, on August 17, 1809, of the Christian Association which soon transformed itself into the first Church of the "Reformation"—Brush Run—May 4, 1811.

V. The adoption of "believer's immersion" led to union with the Baptists in 1812, but differences of doctrine caused the forced expulsion of the Reformers, 1828-1832. Bitter persecution was directed at them by Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, and minor religious bodies, but this persecution is partially explained, if not entirely justified, by Alexander Campbell's virulent attack on the popular clergy, creeds, and other things dear to denominations.

VI. The union with the followers of Stone in 1832 gave the Disciples much greater evangelistic zeal than they would otherwise have attained, but it also brought increased opposition, especially from the Baptists in the West.

VII. The two most distinguishing tenets of the Disciples were immersion and the weekly observance of the Lord's Supper.

VIII. The doctrines of the Reformers were effectively spread by preaching, oral debates, the press, colleges, and organized missions.

IX. In spite of the Mormon delusion and differences of opinion over the name, the millennium, communion, the organ, slavery, and war, the Disciples of Christ increased from two hundred in 1820 to a half million in 1866, the decade ending in 1860 registering a doubling in numbers, or a growth treble the population increase and greater than the percentage gain of any other important religious body in the country. This strength was principally in the western states of that day and in the rural communities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. *Contemporary Newspapers.*

The Christian Baptist, 1823-1830, 15th Edition, St. Louis.

Niles Register. Baltimore, 1811-1848.

II. *Autobiographies, Biographies, Memoirs and Reminiscences.*

Autobiography of Peter Cartwright. Cincinnati. Preface dated 1856.

Babcock, Rufus. Memoirs of John Mason Peck. Philadelphia, 1864.

Bishop, W. W. Mormonism Unveiled, or the Life and Confession of John D. Lee. St. Louis, 1881.

Clay, T. H. Henry Clay. Philadelphia, 1910.

Colton, Calvin. Last Seven Years of the Life of Henry Clay. New York, 1856.

Finley, James. Autobiography of Rev. James B. Finley, or Pioneer Life in the West. Cincinnati, 1853.

Haley, J. J. Makers and Molders of the Reformation Movement. St. Louis, 1914.

Hall, B. M. The Life of Rev. John Clark. New York, 1856.

McClenny, W. The Life of Rev. James O'Kelly. Suffolk, Va., 1910.

McLean, A. Alexander Campbell as a Preacher. New York, 1908.

McLean, A. Thomas and Alexander Campbell. Cincinnati, 1909.

Milburn, W. H. Ten Years of Preacher Life. New York, 1859.

Peck, J. M. Father Clark, or the Pioneer Preacher. Sketches and Incidents of Rev. John Clark. New York, 1855.

Richardson, R. Memoirs of Alexander Campbell. Cincinnati, 1913.

Riley, I. W. The Founder of Mormonism. London, 1903.

Rogers, J. Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone, Written by Himself with Additions and Reflections. Cincinnati, 1847.

Rogers, J. I. Autobiography of Elder Samuel Rogers. Cincinnati, 1909.

Rogers, J. R. The Cane Ridge Meeting House. Cincinnati, 1910 (this work also contains Stone's Autobiography, and a sketch of David Purviance by William Rogers).

Walker, J. B. Experiences of Pioneer Life in the Early Settlements and Cities of the West. Chicago, 1881.

Williams, J. A. Life of Elder John Smith, with Some Account of the Rise and Progress of the Current Reformation. Cincinnati, 1904.

Young, J. Autobiography of a Pioneer. Cincinnati, 1857.

III. *Debates and Miscellaneous Collections of Contemporary Material.*

Bogart, E. L., and Thompson, C. M. Readings in the Economic History of the United States. New York, 1917.

Callender, G. S. Selections from the Economic History of the United States. Boston, 1909.

Campbell, A. The Christian System. Cincinnati, 1835 (?).

Campbell, A. MacCalla-Campbell Debate. Buffalo, 1824.

Campbell, A. Owen-Campbell Debate. Cincinnati, 1829 (?).

Campbell, A. Rice-Campbell Debate. Lexington, 1844.

Campbell, A. Popular Lectures and Addresses (early pages of copy used were missing, but most of the lectures were delivered between 1840-1850).

Gwatkin, H. M. Selections from Early Writers Illustrative of Church History to the Time of Constantine. London, 1909.

Hart, A. B. American History Told by Contemporaries. New York, 1908.

MacNemar, R. The Kentucky Revival. Cincinnati, 1808.

Phillips, U. B. Plantation and Frontier (Commons, J. R., and Phillips, U. G. Documentary History of American Industrial Society, V. I. and II.). Cleveland, 1910.

Smith, B. L. The Millennial Harbinger Abridged, 1830-1866. Cincinnati, 1902.

Woodward, W. W. Surprising Accounts of the Revival of Religion in the United States of America. Philadelphia, 1802.

Young, C. A. Historical Documents Advocating Christian Union. Chicago, 1904.

Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Philadelphia, 1799-1836.

Virginia State Convention. Debates and Proceedings, 1829-30. Richmond, 1830.

IV. *Travels.*

Dwight, Timothy. Travels in New England and New York. London, 1823.

Flint, T. Recollections of the Last Ten Years Passed in Occasional Residences and Journeyings in the Mississippi Valley. Boston, 1826.

Martineau, Harriet. Society in America. London, 1837.

Peck, J. M. Annals of the West. St. Louis, 1850.

Peck, J. M. A Gazetteer of Illinois. Philadelphia, 1837.

Peck, J. M. A New Guide for Emigrants to the West. Boston, 1836.

Shaw, J. Twelve Years in America. London, 1867.

Trollope, Mrs. Domestic Manners of the Americans. New York, 1901.

V. *Histories—Political, Economic and Social.*

(1) American Nation Series (chronological order).

McLaughlin, A. C. Confederation and Constitution. New York, 1905.

Bassett, J. S. The Federalist System. New York, 1906.

Channing, E. The Jeffersonian System. New York, 1906.

Babcock, K. C. Rise of American Nationality. New York, 1906.

Turner, F. J. Rise of the New West. New York, 1906.

MacDonald, W. Jacksonian Democracy. New York, 1906.

Hart, A. B. Slavery and Abolition. New York, 1906.

Garrison, J. P. Westward Extension. New York, 1906.

Smith, T. C. Parties and Slavery. New York, 1906.

Chadwick, F. E. Causes of the Civil War. New York, 1906.

(2) Riverside Series.

Johnson, A. Union and Democracy. Boston, 1915.

Dodd, W. E. Expansion and Conflict. Boston, 1915.

(3) Other Histories.

Adams, Henry. History of the United States, IX. New York, 1904.

Albach, J. R. Annals of the West. Pittsburg, 1858.

Ambler, C. H. Sectionalism in Virginia from 1776 to 1861. Chicago, 1910.

Beggs, S. R. Pages from the Early History of the West. Cincinnati, 1868.

Bogart, E. L. Economic History of the United States. New York, 1915.

Buck, S. J. Some Materials for the Social History of the Mississippi Valley in the Nineteenth Century (reprinted from proceedings of Mississippi Valley Historical Association, for year 1910, 1911. Cedar Rapids, Iowa).

Burnet, J. Notes on the Early Settlement of the Northwestern Territory. Cincinnati, 1847.

Butler, M. Kentucky. Louisville, 1834.

Collins, L. History of Kentucky. Louisville, 1877.

Coman, C. Industrial History of the United States. New York, 1913.

Holst, von H. E. Constitutional and Political History of the United States (translated by J. J. Lalor). Chicago, 1876-1892.

Hunt, William. Political History of England from the Accession of George III. to the Close of Pitt's First Administration, 1760-1801. London, 1905.

Lang, Andrew. A History of Scotland from the Roman Occupation. Edinburgh, 1907.

Lawless, Emily. The Story of the Nations. Ireland, New York, 1887.

McElroy, R. M. Kentucky in the Nation's History. New York, 1909.

McMaster, J. B. History of the People of the United States, IV. New York, 1907.

Muzzey, D. S. An American History. Boston, 1911.

Poussin, G. T. The United States; Its Power and Progress. Philadelphia, 1851.

Schouler, J. History of the United States, II. Washington, 1882.

Simmons, A. M. Social Forces in American History. New York, 1913.

Taylor, C. R. A Universal History of the United States of America. Buffalo, 1833.

Thompson, C. M. History of the United States —Political, Industrial, Social. Chicago, 1917.

Tout, T. F. An Advanced History of Great Britain. London, 1912.

Tuttle, C. R. Centennial Northwest. Madison, 1876.

Walker, C. B. The Mississippi Valley. Burlington, 1879.

VI. *Histories—Religious.*

Allen, G. F. The Old Path Pulpit. Covington, 1886.

Bacon, L. W. A History of American Christianity. New York, 1901.

Buckley, J. M. History of Methodism. New York, 1898.

Burnett, J. H. Origin and Principles of Christians (place and date of publication not given).

Calvin, John. Institutes of Christian Religion (translated by John Allen). Philadelphia, 1873.

Carroll, H. K. The Religious Forces of the United States. New York, 1893.

Cleveland, C. C. The Great Revival in the West. Chicago, 1916.

Coombs, J. V. Campaigning for Christ. Cincinnati, 1897.

Cox, F. A. The Baptists in America. London, 1836.

Davis, M. M. How the Disciples Began and Grew. Cincinnati, 1915.

Davis, M. M. The Restoration Movement of the Nineteenth Century. Cincinnati, 1913.

Foster, R. V. The Cumberland Presbyterian Church. New York, 1904.

Garrison, J. H. Our Movement; Its Origin and Aim. St. Louis, 1881.

Gates, E. The Disciples of Christ. New York, 1905.

Gates, E. Early Relation and Separation of Baptists and Disciples. Chicago, 1904.

Gillett, E. H. History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, II. Philadelphia, 1864.

Hayden, A. S. Early History of Disciples in the Western Reserve; with Biographical Sketches of the Principal Agents in their Religious Movement. Cincinnati, 1875.

Haynes, N. S. History of the Disciples in Illinois. Cincinnati, 1914.

Hurst, J. F. Religious Development (in First Century of the Republic: A Review of American Progress). New York, 1876.

Kirk, H. Van. A History of the Theology of the Disciples of Christ. St. Louis, 1907.

Lappin, S. S. The Training of the Church. Cincinnati, 1911.

Longan, G. W. Origin of the Disciples of Christ. St. Louis, 1889.

Matthews, Lois M. Some Activities of the Congregational Church West of the Mississippi (Turner Essays). New York, 1910.

Moore, W. T. Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ. New York, 1909.

Moore, W. T. The Plea of the Disciples of Christ. Chicago, 1906.

Morrill, M. T. A History of the Christian Denomination in America. Dayton, 1912.

Newman, A. H. A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States. New York, 1902.

Redford, A. H. History of Methodism in Kentucky. Nashville, 1868-1870.

Richardson, R. Principles and Objects of the Religious Reformation Urged by A. Campbell and Others. Bethany, 1852.

Rowe, J. F. History of Reformatory Movements. Cincinnati, 1884.

Summerbell, J. J. Christians and Disciples. Dayton (undated, but about 1913).

Stevens, A. History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, III. New York, 1867.

Thompson, R. E. A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States. New York, 1902.

Tyler, B. B. History of the Disciples of Christ. New York, 1890.

Whitaker, O. B. Vital Distinctions between Christians and Campbellites. Dayton (undated, but about 1913).

VII. *Statistical.*

Census of 1850. Washington, 1853.

Census of 1860. Mortality and Miscellaneous Statistics. Washington, 1866.

Special Reports of the Bureau of the Census. Religious Bodies. Washington, 1906.

Statistical Abstract, 1916. Washington, 1917.

Year Books of Disciples of Christ. Cincinnati, 1911-1918.

APPENDIX I.

The following table shows the increase of some particular states, fairly representative of all sections, and also the density of population per square mile:

	Ala.	Ark.	Ill.	Ind.	Iowa	Ky.
1790						73,677
						1.8
1800				5,641		220,955
						5.5
1810		1,062	12,282	24,520		406,511
			.1	.6		10.1
1820	127,901	14,273	55,211	147,178		564,317
	2.5	.1	1	4.1		14
1830	309,527	30,388	157,445	343,031		687,917
	6	1.6	2.8	9.6		17.1
1840	590,756	97,574	476,183	685,866	43,112	779,828
	11.5	1.9	8.5	19.1	.2	19.4
1850	771,623	209,897	851,470	988,416	192,214	982,405
	15	4	15.2	27.5	3.5	24.4
1860	964,201	435,450	1,711,951	1,350,428	674,913	1,155,684
	18.8	8.3	30.6	37.6	12.1	28.8

	La.	Mass.	Mich.	Minn.	Miss.
1790		378,787			
		47.1			
1800		422,845			8,850
		52.6			.3
1810	76,556	472,040	4,762		20,352
	7.7	58.7	.1—		.4

	La.	Mass.	Mich.	Minn.	Miss.
1820	153,407	523,287	8,896		75,488
	10	65.1	.1—		1.6
1830	215,739	610,408	31,639		136,621
	13.4	75.9	.2		2.9
1840	352,411	737,699	212,267		375,651
	16.8	91.7	3.7		8.1
1850	517,762	994,514	397,654	6,077	606,526
	19.5	123.7	6.9	.1—	13.1
1860	708,002	1,231,066	749,113	172,023	791,305
	21	153	13	2.1	17.1

	Mo.	New York	N. C.	Ohio	Pa.
1790		340,120	393,751		434,373
		7.1	8.1		9.7
1800		589,051	478,103	45,365	602,365
		12.4	9.8	1.1	13.4
1810	19,783	959,049	555,500	230,760	810,091
		20.1	11.4	5.7	18.1
1820	66,586	1,372,812	638,829	581,434	1,049,458
		28.8	13.1	14.5	23.4
1830	140,455	1,918,608	737,987	937,903	1,384,233
	2.1	40.3	15.1	23.3	30.1
1840	383,702	2,428,921	753,419	1,519,467	1,724,033
	5.6	51	15.5	37.3	38.5
1850	682,044	3,097,394	869,039	1,980,329	2,311,786
	9.9	65	17.8	48.6	51.6
1860	1,182,012	3,880,735	992,622	2,339,511	2,906,215
	17.2	81.4	20.4	57.4	64.8

	S. C.	Tenn.	Tex.	Va.	Wis.
1790	249,073	35,691		747,610	
	8.2	.8		11.6	
1800	345,591	105,602		880,200	
	11.3	2.5		13.7	
1810	415,115	261,727		974,600	
	13.6	6.3		15.2	

APPENDIX I.

	S. C.	Tenn.	Tex.	Va.	Wis.
1820	502,741	422,823		1,065,366	
	16.5	10.1		16.6	
1830	581,185	681,904		1,211,405	
	19.1	16.4		18.9	
1840	594,398	829,210		1,239,797	30,945
	19.5	19.9		19.3	.4
1850	668,507	1,002,717	212,592	1,421,661	305,391
	21.9	24.1	.8	22.1	5.5
1860	703,708	1,109,801	604,215	1,596,318	775,881 [1]
	23.1	26.6	2.3	24.8	14

[1] Statistical Abstract, 1916.

APPENDIX II.

GROWTH OF TYPICAL CITIES, 1790-1860

	Baltimore	Boston	Buffalo	Charleston, S. C.	Chicago
1790	13,503	18,038		16,359	
1800	26,114	24,937		20,473	
1810	35,583	33,250	1,508	24,711	
1820	62,738	43,298	2,095	24,780	
1830	80,625	61,392	8,653	30,289	
1840	102,313	93,383	18,213	29,261	
1850	169,054	136,881	42,261	42,985	
1860	212,418	177,840	81,129	40,522	109,260

	Cincinnati	Detroit	Louisville	Milwaukee	Mobile
1790					
1800	750		359		
1810	2,540		1,357		
1820	9,642		4,012		1,500
1830	24,831		10,341		3,194
1840	46,338	9,102	21,210	1,700	12,672
1850	115,436	21,019	43,194	20,061	20,515
1860	161,044	45,619	68,033	45,246	29,258

	Nashville	New Orleans	New York	Philadelphia	Pittsburgh
1790			33,131	42,520	
1800			60,489	69,403	1,565
1810		17,242	96,373	91,874	4,768
1820		27,176	123,706	112,772	7,248
1830	5,566	46,310	202,589	161,410	12,568

APPENDIX II.

	Nashville	New Orleans	New York	Philadelphia	Pittsburgh
1840	6,929	102,193	312,710	220,423	21,115
1850	10,478	116,375	515,547	340,045	46,601
1860	16,988	168,675	813,669	565,529	49,217

	Portland	St. Louis	Savannah	San Francisco	Richmond
1790					3,761
1800	3,677		5,166		5,737
1810	7,169	1,600	5,215		9,735
1820	8,581	4,598	7,523		12,067
1830	12,601	5,852	7,776		16,060
1840	15,218	16,469	11,214		20,153
1850	20,218	77,860	15,312	34,776 (1852	27,570
1860	26,341	160,773	22,292	56,802	37,910

	Washington, D. C.
1790	
1800	3,210
1810	8,208
1820	13,247
1830	18,827
1840	23,364
1850	40,001
1860	61,122 [1]

[1] Census Reports, 1850, 52, and 1860, XVIII., XIX.

EUREKA
CANTON
JACKSONVILLE
INDIANAPOLIS
CINCINNATI
COLUMBIA
LEXINGTON
WELLSBURG
PITTSBURG